DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 446 UD 028 815

AUTHOR	Castaneda, Lillian Vega
TITLE	Site Descriptive Protocols of Programs for Ethnolinguistically Diverse Classrooms.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Regional Lab., Los Alamitos, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Apr 92
NOTE	89p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; Effective Schools Research; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Excellence in Education; High Risk Students; *Limited English Speaking; *Minority Group Children; Multicultural Education; *Program Descriptions; *School Districts; School Statistics; *Special Needs Students; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

The Southwest Regional Laboratory's Metropolitan Educational Trends and Research Outcomes (METRO) Center processed 17 descriptions of exemplary sites that addressed the needs of language minority, limited English proficient students. Data were collected regarding program features; schools' and districts' size, geographic location, grades served, number of classes involved, and languages spoken; school organization; instructional leadership; school climate; student characteristics and performance; instructional features; and support components. This report provides descriptive data, in the form of survey item responses, for the following six sites and programs that were found to have the most comprehensive documentation and support data: (1) the Irvine (California) Unified School District's Pre-School Program; (2) the Nogales (Arizona) High School Comprehensive Bilingual Program; (3) the San Diego (California) City Schools' Central Elementary School (a school restructuring process for all children); (4) the Glendale (California) Unified School District's Sheltered English Approach (an academic excellence program); (5) the Irvine (California) Unified School District's Sheltered English Program at the Secondary Schools; and (6) the San Diego (California) City Schools' Linda Vista Elementary School. These programs successfully address the needs of ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse students. (RLC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory

4665 Lampson Ave., Los Alamitos, CA 90720

(213) 598-7661

ED348446

Lillian Vega Castaneda
Southwest Regional Laboratory

April 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD028815

Overview of METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocols

for

Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations

March 31, 1992

The Southwest Regional Laboratory

Introduction

The METRO Center's Improving Programs of Schools Serving Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Student Populations is aimed at identifying programs that have successfully addressed the needs of ethnically, linguistically, and culturally diverse students. The two main objectives are to:

- identify instructional strategies required for culturally and linguistically diverse students to most effectively and efficiently (a) develop English language proficiency and (b) reach grade level in academic achievement in English; and
- identify programs and curricula recognized for their success in addressing the needs of educationally disadvantaged students along dimensions that support the instructional needs of ethnolinguistically diverse student populations.

In order to identify successful programs, METRO staff asked colleagues throughout the country to nominate "exemplary" sites that addressed the needs of language minority (LM), Limited English Proficient (LEP) students. The nomination process began in June, 1991. We judged programs successfully to be was based on evidence of at least two years sustained gains in student academic achievement in English language proficiency. Of the 42 sites nominated, 22 did not fit the objectives of the research project: Two sites were not included in the sample, because of their instructional emphasis, which did not deal specifically with instruction in multiple-language contexts.

Thus, a total of 20 nominated sites were contacted by METRO staff and asked to submit various types of program information for screening processes and for the developing of site descriptive protocols. In determining criteria for programs to be considered as promising, staff looked at similar research and validation efforts. Criteria were drawn from the California Department of Education's *Process for Recognizing Excellence in Bilingual Education: Exemplary*

Programs and Practices and the SWRL based *Descriptive Study of the Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Programs (SAIP).*

Sites were asked to provide information regarding program features (e.g., a description of a particular program, curriculum or practice) and dimensions of school and district data related to size, geographic location, grades served, number of classes involved, languages spoken. Additional documentation surrounded school organization, instructional leadership, school climate, student characteristics and performance, instructional features and support components. To date, 17 sites have responded by providing the requested documentation. Site descriptive protocols (SDPs) were developed for these sites. Those not responding have been contacted by phone and encouraged to respond by contributing their respective district information.

The following sites were determined to have the most comprehensive documentation and support data. Additional information is being sought from the others. The various sites have some commonalties in theoretical orientation, delivery of instruction, and program design. While it is not the intent to provide this analyses in this overview, these patterns are consistent with the research-based framework to identify or develop successful approaches in multilingual settings (Castaneda, 1992) as well as findings from the recently completed *Descriptive Study of Significant Features of Exemplary Special Alternative Instructional Programs* (SAIP Study), (Tikunoff et al, 1992).

The following descriptions provide a brief overview of the nominated sites which have submitted extensive data for inclusion in the development of a site descriptive protocol.

•*Linda Vista Elementary School: A Comprehensive Program Model.* What started as a middle to working class Anglo community, then changed to a largely black working class community, is now a largely Southeast Asian neighborhood, with increasing numbers of LEP students from mainly Latino backgrounds. This program addresses the needs of all students, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, primary language or cultural background. A comprehensive program undertook restructuring of the kindergarten annex and elementary school. In it, staff, community members, students and site administrator work together to address the needs of a multilingual, multicultural student population. A variety of educational strands were offered, including mainstream English, bilingual (Vietnamese and Spanish), sheltered strand (broken down by level of language proficiency) and transitional program for LEP students entering an English only classroom. As well, this program provided continuous, formalized opportunities for integrating its students through the use of school wide scheduling, sheltered content instruction, teaming of teachers, instructional aides, and members of the community.

•*Central Elementary School: A School Restructuring Process For All Children.* This school is located in a largely working class community about 25 miles from the Mexican border. Experienced for years in integrating the children of immigrants, the district has been recognized nationally for its bilingual education programs and for the leadership it has provided. The school began a process of restructuring five years ago. Central began an intensive "internal" staff development program, in order to begin a process of shared management. Through this process, the school formulated a philosophy that under girds curriculum and instruction in which there is a shared belief that all children can learn and "show academic progress each year." The program is characterized by an adoption of an 11 month school year, an alternative reading program adoption, ungraded primary instruction, an entry level class for recent immigrants, integration of special education students, a second language program, primary language program and literature based instruction. This is achieved through a variety of grouping and regrouping mechanisms for both staff and students.

•*Sheltered Content Instruction in the Irvine Unified School District:* The majority of LEP students in this school district come from upper to middle class Asian families. The sons and daughters of corporate executives (often on temporary assignment to the U.S. from countries like Korea and Taiwan to name a few), they come to the United States with the main interest of learning English and American culture. A few Latino LEP children may still be found in the district, as the district was once surrounded by burgeoning farmland, worked by migrant workers. Other students come from Europe and the Middle East. Middle school and high school students receive formal content area instruction in a sheltered English language development environment. Recent arrivals attend a magnet immersion program (maximum 1 year) prior to placement in a sheltered class.

•*The Sheltered English Approach: An Academic Excellence Program:* This school district is located in a middle class community, with an increasing number of ethnolinguistic children and their families, moving in (e.g., Mexicans, Central Americans, Armenians, Vietnamese, Chinese and Koreans). This Academic Excellence project is designed to provide content area instruction for LEP students in Grades 4-6 who require both language and concept development support in social studies, science and health. LEP, non-English proficient (NEP) and fluent English proficient (FEP) students were grouped together in this multifunctional program which serves as an umbrella for participants in the transitional bilingual education program. In this sense, the program functions as a critical component of a comprehensive program addressing the needs of all students, offering strands in the "regular" (English only), bilingual (primary language literacy) and multiple language programs. Students who came from minority languages for whom instruction in their first language (L1) was not offered, received instruction in a multiple-language context. Students

from the bilingual strand often entered the SAIP as a "transition" prior to entering into the mainstream instructional context.

•*Irvine School District: Pre-School Program:* The primary goal of this project is to establish an early intervention program to prevent school failure. The major objective is to provide a "carefully designed early childhood learning environment in which children can be stimulated to achieve motor, sensorial, language, affective and intellectual development, literacy skills, acquire a second language and progress successfully in the elementary school years. The underlying theoretical framework recognizes the importance of early childhood education, with an approach which incorporates both Piagetian and Vygotskian. Motivational, affective and physical factors are considered as very important to the learning process. In this district-wide program, children engage in ungraded instructional settings. The program offers three language strands: primary, sheltered and mainstream.

•*Nogales High School Comprehensive Bilingual Program:* The mission statement that guides this program states that there is a shared belief that "all students are capable of learning and can be successful." Further, there is a statement that says "teachers cause learning" and can be a "positive influence in the lives of students". The curriculum that drives instruction is designed to accommodate all students. In this school-wide program, teachers team in order to provide effective instruction to LM/LEP students. Further, students engage in laboratory instruction, (e.g., computer assisted instruction). Courses offered for the LEP student may be found across the various departments (e.g., typing, bilingual secretarial skills, ESL I, ESL II, ESL III, International Baccalaureate Spanish III and IV (advanced placement level), world history, American history, pre-algebra, algebra I and II, and biology). Two fully bilingual counselors are available in the counseling office to advise LM/LEP students. Staff at Nogales High are encouraged to receive an ESL or Bilingual endorsement in order to teach LEP classes. Teachers receive an addendum of $800 for a provisional endorsement and $2,000 for a full endorsement. Thirty-six out of 82 classroom teachers are bilingual, or ESL endorsed.

METRO center staff will continue to augment these site descriptive protocols, especially as we begin to enter the sites and a more focused study toward the development of several case studies.

METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocol

Pre-School Program, Irvine Unified School District
Irvine, California

March 1992

A Title VII Transitional Bilingual Education Program for 3, 4 and 5 Year Old Hispanic, Chinese and Japanese Children - Irvine Unified School District

School District Context: Irvine Unified School District (IUSD)

1. Locale:

   Region: West

   State: California

   County: Orange

   Irvine is located in Orange County some 37 miles southwest of Los Angeles. A straight-line extrapolation of 1980 census data yields 87.8% White, 1.5% Black, 1.8% Japanese, 2.0% Chinese, 3.3% Other Asian and Pacific Islander plus other diverse groups. 22.8% of population is age between 25 and 34, and 16.93% is between 35 and 44. The trend in the decade indicates that there will be a significant decrease in the proportion of White persons.

2. Number of Students in District: 20, 025

   ____ Over 100,000

   ____ 50,000 - 100,000

   ____ 25,000 - 50,000

   _X_ 5,000 - 25,000

   ____ Under 5,000

3. Number of schools/level:

   _18_ Elem (including K)

   _4_ Middle/JHS

   _4_ High schools

   ____ Vocational

   ____ Alternative

   ____ Others

Note: Student enrollment in the IUSD increased at a rate of 2% per year until 1884, and by 2.8% in the 1985-86. 6% of enrollment in 1986-87 were represented by incoming new students.

4. LEP students in district: 1973 (Based on 1991 Data BICAL)

   1,973 Total

   99 Pre-School

   Note: Only number of students in program was given. LEP student enrollment has increased 27% per year. There were 429 LEP students in 1980, 775 in 1983, and 1026 in 1986.

5. Personnel involved with Pre-school LEP students:

	Teachers	Administrators	Paraprofessional
____ Total			
____ Pre-School	4	1	5

   Note: 100% time. The paraprofessionals consist of one special projects clerk and four teacher assistants.

6. Minority languages represented among students in the district: Spanish, Vietnamese, Chinese, Farsi, Japanese, Korean, Others.

7. Country of birth : United States, Mexico, Central America, South America Caribbean, Others (reflected in the language groups above).

   Note: Of the 44 students for whom data on country of birth were available, 50% were born outside the United States, with no break-down of countries, reflected in the data on "language first learned" question.

8. SES level of students in the district: Upper to middle income. This is largely a professional, educated community.

   The city of Irvine is located in a very high-cost area, and the income of the residents from the 1980 Census exceeds the national average significantly. 23.6% had an income $25,000 - $34,999 and 24.8% had an income $35,000 - $49,999.

9. Parental information (percent): insufficient data

   Occupation: ____Laborers ____Skilled workers ____Professional

   Education: ____Less than HS ____HS graduates 44.7 College grads

   Income level: ____Below poverty

   Note: Another 28.3% of the residents completed 1-3 years of college. The level of the education of the residents of Irvine is very high.

Bilingual program:

Type: Preschool

Title VII funding: Yes. See #50

Main objective: See # 19 and #20

Description of: See # 19 and #20

Student activities:

Student personnel service:

School improvement activities:

Library and media program: Computers are increasingly being introduced into educational activities

Athletics:

Community relations:

Community characteristics: Refer to #1, #10, and #11

Program Features

Theoretical Framework:

Recognizes the importance of early childhood education, with an approach incorporating both Piagetian and Vygotskian approaches, and enhanced by more recent studies and practices. In addition, motivational, affective and physical factors are considered as very important to the learning process.

Goals and Objectives:

The primary goal is to establish a successful early intervention program designed to prevent school failure. The objectives are to provide "a carefully designed early childhood learning environment in which they can be stimulated to achieve motor, sensorial, language, affective and intellectual development to achieve literacy skills, acquire a second language and progress successfully in the Elementary school years."

Information on LEP Students in program:

10. Number of LEP students in program:

_99_ Total

_99_ Pre-K to K+

____ Elementary

____ JHS/Middle School

____ HS

____ Vocational

____ Alternative

____ Others

11. Minority languages represented in program:

Spanish	18.3%
Vietnamese	10.8%
Chinese	10.8%
Farsi	12.9%
Japanese	15.1%
Korean	14.0%
English	15.1%
Others	3.2%

Note: Although 15.1% of the population have English as its first language, these children are not proficient in English due to both parents conversing in English as their second language (cross-cultural marriages).

12. Countries of birth represented in program:

Of the 44 students, 50% were born in the United States. The first language is a good indication of the country of birth, with the exception of those children.

13. SES level of students in program compared with district:

Note: Data on community suggest that LEP students are from families that are largely Asian and Middle Eastern, well educated, middle class, business and professional. A large number of Hispanic children come from families who live in relative isolation from the rest of the community.

Program Characteristics

14. Extensiveness of program:

_X_ District-wide program (Program serves several schools)

___ School-wide program (All classes at a school contain LEP students in program)

___ Partial school program (A portion of the grades participate in the program)

_X_ Self-contained instruction (All instruction is provided in the classroom)

_X_ Ungraded (Many age levels frequently in the same instructional setting)

___ Graded (Students of same age always in the same instructional setting)

___ Pull-out instruction (LEP students receive some instruction outside the classroom)

___ Other

3-5 year old Grade level(s)/within a school (include grade levels)

15. How English language development is provided: detailed in note below

_X_ ESL instruction (Formal ESL instruction is provided as a separate instructional period)

___ English language development instruction

__ Sheltered English (English proficiency is developed using English as the medium for providing comprehensible content area instruction)

_X_ Integrated English instruction (English development is integrated into content instruction)

___ English immersion (Teachers are fluent in students' native language(s), but instruct only in English)

___ Computer support (Some English is taught using CAI)

_X_ Individualized instruction (IEPs are developed for individual students and formulate the basis for developing English proficiency)

_X_ Special textbooks/instructional materials are provided (for example, AGP Holt Math program, Houghton Mifflin Series Reading Program, ELEPS)

___ Literature based program

___ Other (please describe)

Note: The program offers three language strands: primary, sheltered and mainstream. In the words of the Project Evaluator, language is "as thoroughly sheltered as" any he has seen. The sheltering is a consequence of its intense material-driven nature in which all conversation is "centered on a tangible present reality" (the materials) with linguistic learning and conceptual learning occurring together.

16. Target content areas:

_X_ Mathematics

Goal: Achieve early comprehension of numerical concepts and the development of math readiness.

Objective: Annual improvement in numerical concepts and math readiness as evidenced by a post-test median score that will be 5 Percentile Ranks (PR) higher than the pretest median PR on the Test of Basic Experience (TOBE).

_X_ Language Acquisition

Goal: (1) English competency in listening and fluency in speech and the readiness for developing writing and reading skills (2) support LEP students with native language instruction for overall development (3) LEP students acquire native-like English fluency by integration with regular classroom (4) second language fluency acquired by monolingual anglophones via immersion education.

Objectives: (1) In two years, LEP students achieve level of proficiency in oral English equivalent to native-speaking English peers as measured by the student

Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) (2) Show an improvement in language arts skills and reading readiness by a post-test median score that will be 5 Percentile Ranks (PR) higher than the pretest median PR on the Test of Basic Experience (TOBE).

_X_ Social Studies

Goal: not stated explicitly but similar to the language acquisition part. In the program, social studies are integrated into the language instruction and related activities are incorporated into the daily routines.

Objective: Implicit in the program is the well-adjustness of the child in a normal classroom.

___ Language Arts
Goals and objectives:

_X_ Science

Goal: not stated explicitly but similar to the language acquisition part. In the program, science is integrated into the language instruction and related activities are incorporated into the daily routines.

Objective: Implicit in the program objective is that child acquire common body of science knowledge so as to be ready for entry into normal kindergarten classroom.

_X_ Music

Goal: not stated explicitly but similar to the language acquisition part. In the program, music is integrated as part of daily activities.

Objective: Implicit in the program objective is that child develops ability to appreciate music

_X_ Art

Goal: not stated explicitly but similar to the language acquisition part. In the program, art is integrated as part of daily activities

Objective: Implicit in the program objective is development of the child's artistic skills.

17. Affective and developmental areas:

Motor Development:

Goal: Provide purposeful activities to achieve requisite manual skills required for writing and reading, and more broadly success in everyday life.

Objective: Average improvement of 30% per year in motor development as measured by the Observation Checklist (OCL) and class observation.

Sensorial Development:

Goal: Promote sensorial development through experiences that will provide foundations for intellectual growth.

Objective: Average improvement of 30% per year in motor development as measured by the Observation Checklist (OCL) and class observation.

Affective Development:

Goal: Promote inner motivation and develop self-initiated learning

Objective: information not available

Note: Integral to the approach in this program is the assumption that "on-task students are the only ones who learn." Teachers monitor the student's inner motivation to learn by observing the direction, intensity and the duration of the student's behavior. Students are encouraged to learn by having the entire program being materials-driven. Language materials are in both languages, and the materials are based on experts' understanding of interesting and motivating materials which promote optimal levels of development.

18. Salient and unique features (list the features that distinguish this program and contribute to its uniqueness):

This program is one of tremendous completeness in every phase in its planning and execution. Its abundance in resources is evident from the instructional materials, the environment, the ratio of instructor to student, and the training of the staff. Just as impressive is its overall structure and its framework. It addresses as best as it can with every facet of early childhood education, and sets goals nothing short of complete integration of the LEP students into the beginning grades for academic success. The program is "material driven" to a degree far beyond the usual bilingual program. The language is thoroughly sheltered, and the program is fully individualized.

19. Trends and future agenda - emerging themes:

It is evident that for LEP students and/or at-risk children, the earlier the identification and intervention, the more likely the subsequent success of these children in their education. Since it is rare for LEAs to conduct early childhood programs for this population, it is all the more important to address these issues. Aside from the obvious benefits to these pre-school LEP children, it may be that from a budgetary point of view, early childhood program may be a better long-term investment. The second issue is the transition from early childhood programs to the beginning grades. Studies to identify model transitional programs are underway. The program at Irvin may serve as an exemplary model for other LEAs where budget is not a serious constraint.

Curriculum Characteristics:

Note: The *Curriculum Design* is based on four *structural conditions:* (1) entry characteristics of the child; (2) subject matter area; (3) appropriate language to insure comprehensibility; (4) readiness of child at a particular time juncture for a particular experience. The alignment of these four structural conditions for each individual child is the key to this program. The program is fully individualized. The Curriculum Design is shown below:

Language Strands

Levels of English Proficiency	*Primary Language*	*Sheltered English*	*Mainstream English*
Pre-Production	Reading Social Studies Math Science	ESL	Music, Art, PE

Language Strands (continued)

Levels of English Proficiency	*Primary Language*	*Sheltered English*	*Mainstream English*
Early Production	Reading Social Studies Science	ESL Math	Music, Art, PE
Speech Emergence	Reading Social Studies	ESL Science	Music, Art, PE Math
Intermediate Fluency	Reading	Translate English Rdg Social Studies	Music, Art, PE Math Science
Full Fluency	Reading		Music, Art, PE Math Science Social Studies Reading

20. Number of classes offered :

___ Total
__4__ Pre-K to K+
___ Elementary
___ JHS/Middle
___ HS
___ Vocational
___ Alternative:
___ Others

21. Types of classes offered:

___ Language - Mode of delivery:
Whole language:
__X__ ESL
__X__ LEP English
__X__ Social Studies
__X__ Mathematics
__X__ Science
___ Reading
__X__ Music
__X__ Art
___ Business
___ Other

22. Materials used in curriculum:

_X_ Special collection of problems (e.g., practical math problems)

_X_ Guides for teachers

_X_ Manuals for students (e.g., style manuals in writing)

_X_ Special library collections

_X_ Other - extensive collection of bilingual materials, e.g. language materials are in both the child's first language and English.

Note: The amount and quality of the materials are very extensive by any standard. It is not possible to list all of them in this protocol. Refer to evaluation report for a detailed listing.

Student Characteristics and Performance

Student Characteristics:

23. Population of students from which selection is made: See note below

Math: ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Writing: ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Reading: ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Speaking: ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Listening: ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Social Studies:
____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Language Arts:
____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Science: ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Affective ____ The entire student body including LEP students
____ All LEP students

Note: The 99 students were self-selected by the parents. The children come from seemingly stable home environments. Only 1 out of the 90 reporting is from a 1-parent home. The mother stays home in 83.3% of the cases.

24. Selection methods and entry requirements: see note below

Math:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Writing:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Reading:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests):

Speaking:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Listening:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Social Studies:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Language Arts:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Science:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Affective:
____ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Note: The program consists of 99 children of age 3, 4 or 5 in the Irvin Unified School District with English language difficulties. Due the instability of the room situation in a crowded School District, the location of the program was moved around resulting in the need of some of recruitment for participants.

25. Control group for comparison: see note below

Math:	____ Yes	____ No
Writing:	____ Yes	____ No
Reading:	____ Yes	____ No
Speaking:	____ Yes	____ No
Listening:	____ Yes	____ No
Social Science	____ Yes	____ No
Language Arts:	____ Yes	____ No
Science:	____ Yes	____ No
Affective:	____ Yes	____ No

Note: This program uses the *Gap Reduction Evaluation Model* developed by RMC Corporation to evaluate bilingual programs. This model requires that longitudinal data be collected for two groups: a LEP treatment group and a mainstream comparison group. The goal is to reduce the gap between these two groups as the treatment progresses. Success is defined as that no gap exists between these two groups at the end of the treatment. It permits periodic measurement of the percentage of the amount of the initial gap which has been closed as the treatment is implemented and continued over time.

Results on the Irvin program is available for the three years: 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90.

Student Performance:

26. Length of supporting data:

____ Two years

_X_ Three or more years: 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90.

27. Evaluation Effectiveness:

_X_ Comparative data: mainstream group

_X_ Longitudinal data (e.g., TAP score of LEP students)

___ Objective standards (standardized tests or state tests)

_X_ Subjective standards (e.g. teacher evaluation)

___ Other (e.g., library request frequency)

28. Length of time in program: three years

29. Educational outcomes: Test of Basic Experience (TOBE) 2 from CTB/McGraw-Hill was the measuring instrument. TOBE 2 is composed of four tests, one subtest in each of the area of language, mathematics, science and social science. Each test consists of 26 items, and is administered orally with the student selecting the pictorial response. According to manual, TOBE 2 is designed to "measure the differences in children's awareness of the world around them." It should be noted that TOBE 2 was designed for use with kindergarten students. Although the

children in this study were younger, no other appropriate instrument of comparable quality was found. In addition, the test items in each area matched well with the instructional activities and objectives.

_X_ Gains in English proficiency

_X_ Gains in academic performance: The methodology is the gap reduction model of RMC Corporation, i.e. outcome is judged relative to the performance of a criterial mainstream group of comparable students. The results is presented in tabular form (N=33).

		Year	
	Statistics	1988-89	*1989-90*
Language:	Mean	52.03	*67.00*
	SD	24.91	*21.31*
Math:	Mean	54.33	*72.25*
	SD	22.18	*18.58*
Science:	Mean	53.85	*72.67*
	SD	27.54	*22.07*
Social Science:	Mean	47.15	*70.00*
	SD	30.66	*22.14*

At the end of the first year, the project students exceeded slightly the average of mainstream students (represented by norm tables) in language, mathematics and science, and slightly below the average in the area of social science. At the end of the second year, the project students exceeded by a great deal the average of mainstream students (represented by norm tables) in all four content areas.

Longitudinal results on the TOBE subtests broken down by primary language are of interest. However, it should be noted that the sample size is small in several languages (N=2 or 3).

		Language		*Math*		*Science*		*Social Science*	
Primary Language	Statistics	88-89	*89-90*	88-89	*89-90*	88-89	*89-90*	88-89	*89-90*
English:	Mean	58.89	*68.06*	60.78	*73.55*	63.33	*73.21*	54.56	*77.06*
	SD	24.60	*18.56*	21.90	*13.02*	24.25	*19.60*	26.16	*17.41*
	N	9	*18*	9	*20*	9	*19*	9	*18*
Spanish:	Mean	87.00	*63.15*	82.00	*62.39*	87.33	*69.75*	88.00	*65.31*
	SD	15.13	*27.43*	8.66	*28.38*	12.90	*20.75*	15.72	*20.60*
	N	3	*13*	3	*13*	3	*12*	3	*13*
Chinese:	Mean	68.00	*49.00*	66.50	*50.22*	72.00	*60.67*	77.50	*58.50*
	SD	2.83	*20.57*	6.36	*25.15*	4.24	*22.58*	3.54	*23.43*
	N	2	*9*	2	*9*	2	*9*	2	*8*
Japanese:	Mean	44.42	*67.40*	50.83	*73.64*	55.33	*67.20*	43.75	*64.07*
	SD	21.59	*13.81*	22.31	*11.53*	22.61	*22.69*	28.67	*22.15*
	N	12	*15*	12	*14*	12	*15*	12	*15*

Farsi:	Mean	47.50	*51.33*	50.50	*37.08*	45.50	*42.75*	25.00	*43.08*
	SD	10.61	*23.31*	4.95	*14.04*	20.51	*24.93*	33.94	*22.76*
	N	2	*12*	2	*12*	2	*12*	2	*12*
Korean:	Mean	32.00	*40.00*	36.00	*52.27*	18.83	*43.82*	21.33	*38.73*
	SD	20.27	*17.27*	14.71	*16.90*	17.82	*16.51*	17.55	*17.93*
	N	6	*11*	6	*11*	6	*11*	6	*11*
Viet:	Mean		*74.00*		*57.50*		*66.00*		*64.40*
	SD		*16.84*		*16.47*		*8.72*		*16.76*
	N		*10*		*10*		*10*		*10*

It was noted that the data here dealt with two different samples with the 34 students from 1988-89 included in the 88 students in 89-90. The groups with large sample size (English, Japanese and Korean) from 88-89 seem to have made excellent growth. In the 89-90 group, the best performing group was the Vietnamese, followed by the English, Japanese, Spanish, Farsi, Chinese and Korean.

30. Affective and developmental outcomes:

No objective measures were used. The conclusion is based on the teachers' record on the Observation Check List (OCL), which included records of development of motor skills and control of movement in activities involved in daily life and observations on sensorial foundations for intellectual development. The subjects seemed to have prospered in an environment which was child-centered (e.g. furnitures and utilities were scaled down to their size) and fully individualized with a abundance of structured and organized materials for exploration and instruction.

Instructional Features

31. Instructional strategies:

___ "Regular" classroom instruction (with no specialized instruction)

_X_ Team teaching (Two or more teachers/aids are responsible for instruction in the same classroom)

____ Peer teaching (Older students with more English proficiency work with LEP students to provide translation)

____ Cooperative grouping (Instructional activities require that students collaborate to produce a common product)

_X_ Individualized instruction (IEPs and other strategies are used to individualize instruction for students)

____ Language experience approach (Reading, writing, speaking, and listening are taught interactively, building on students' experiences as basis for language learning experiences)

_X_ Small group instruction (Students are grouped for instruction along with varying criteria which are instructional related)

___ Laboratory instruction (Students are provided variety of environment in a single laboratory for learning skills and content. e.g., computer-assisted-instruction)

____ Community resources (Resources from outside the school, including volunteers, are tapped to provide instructional support)

____ Other

Note: The instruction is child-driven as the child sets the order, the pace depending on his/her interest. The teacher's role is to be encouraging and to help the child to transform himself/herself. This program is child-centered and fully individualized.

32. Plan design:

___ Overseeing committees

_X_ Staff development and activities for teachers (e.g., teaching strategies)

___ Relevance to other curriculum areas

___ Shared responsibilities (among all segments: teachers, adm., etc)

_X_ Timeline for goals to be accomplished - three years of individualized instruction

33. Learning skills and strategies: not applicable

____ Metacognitive strategies

____ Critical thinking skills

____ Student-self evaluation

____ Test-taking strategies

____ Research skills

Note: The primary skill developed in this program is that of classification. Extensive materials were used to help the child to understand the concept of a "variable" and in promoting understanding of the interaction of variables and the critical ability of classification.

Instructional personnel:

34. Training and support:

_X_ Teachers are trained in language development techniques

___ Teachers hold state certification for teaching LEP students

_X_ Staff development is provided program staff in latest research and methodologies

___ Staff development is regularly provided for mainstream teachers in language development strategies

_X_ Teachers are provided planning time during the school day

_X_ Instructional aides (bilingual IAs assist teachers in the classroom)

Note: Extensive training was provided to the teachers with a preservice component and an inservice component. The goal was to "provide staff training which will increase staff capacities to effectively support LEP students in achieving all the objectives." In the preservice component, the Project Director taught a number of university level courses, and the inservice was provided in the internship course on project implementation. The preservice courses concentrated on the use of manipulatives in understanding mathematics, in achieving literacy skills in language acquisition, in establishing sensorial foundations for reading and mathematics, in promoting motor and cognitive development . This totaled 300 hours. Twelve university units were given by U.C Irvine.

Support Components

35. Staff characteristics:
    - ____ ESL or bilingual certificated
    - _X_ Speaks language of LEP students
    - _X_ Continuing inservice training

36. Staff incentives:
    - ____ Monetary compensation
    - ____ Workload compensation
    - ____ Salary schedule inducement for graduate course
    - _X_ University credits or program certification

37. Student support:
    - ____ Bilingual counselors
    - _X_ Bilingual secretaries: one

38. Parental involvement: no information
    - ____ Parent advisory committee
    - ____ Parents as volunteer
    - ____ Evening ESL classes for parents
    - ____ Teacher-parent conference
    - ____ Home visits by bilingual liaisons
    - ____ Open house
    - ____ Other

39. Community involvement: none
    - ____ Social service agencies
    - ____ Volunteer groups
    - ____ Other

40. Curriculum and instructional support:
    - ____ Library materials
    - ____ Media equipment (computer, video tapes, etc)

Note: Extensive materials were developed and organized in such a fashion to promote in the child his/her awareness of "criterial sensory characteristics such as size, shape, texture, weight, height, length, pitch, loudness, duration, tone color, intensity, hue, etc." The distinctiveness of these materials is their richness in helping the child to understand the concept of a "variable" and in promoting understanding of the interaction of variables and the critical ability of classification.

Mainstreaming and Integration:

41. Time required before students are mainstreamed into regular classroom: three years
42. Procedure and methods by which LEP students in program are integrated with the student body: none. As a preschool program, these students progress in a normal fashion to kindergarten.
43. Follow-up achievement data on LEP students after leaving program: data not available as the first group of students are just beginning to enroll in the mainstream classroom.
44. Procedures by which LEP students add English reading prior to redesignating to FEP status: none as pre-schoolers, they naturally enroll in kindergarten..
45. Procedure/Criteria for redesignating from LEP to FEP status: none as pre-schoolers, the program was designed to become FEP over a period of three years.

Funding

46. Source and history :

_X_ Funded by Title VII

_X_ Supported by state and local funding - Irvine Unified School District

___ Supported solely by state and local funding, but previously funded by Title V

___ Supported by special state funding

___ Supported by other federal funding

_X_ Collaboratively funded by two or more agencies or sources

47. Amount of funding:

Approximately one third of the cost is born by Title VII while the Irvin Unified School District underwrites the other two thirds.

Year	*Title VII*	*IUSD*
1987-88	37.32%	62.68%
1988-89	33.80%	66.20%
1989-90	32.34%	67.66%

Only dollar amount was given for the 1989-90 school year, with $208,480 coming from Title VII and $436,209 coming from IUSD with a student expenditure of $6,512.

METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocol

Nogales High School, Nogales, Arizona

March 1992

School District Context:

1. Locale:

   Region: Southwest

   State: Arizona

   County:

   Located in a region of rapid growth on the border between the United States and Mexico- 1990 Census show 22,000, an increase of almost 10,000 since 1980. The sister city Nogales, Sonora, Mexico has a population of over 250,000; a growth of almost 100,000 since 1980.

2. Number of Students in District:

   ____Over 100,000
   ____ 50,000 - 100,000
   ____ 25,000 - 50,000
   __X__ 5,000 - 25,000
   ____ Under 5,000

3. Number of schools/level:

   __5__ Elem (including K)
   __2__ Middle/JHS
   __1__ High schools
   __1__ Vocational
   ____ Alternative
   ____ Others

4. District enrollment:

6000 Total
____ Elem (including K)
____ Middle/JHS
1800+ High schools
____ Vocational
100+ Alternative
____ Others

5. District personnel:

	Teachers	Administrators	Paraprofessional
____ Total			
____ Elem (including K)			
____ Middle/JHS			
100 High schools	88	3	9
____ Vocational			
5 Alternative	3	1	1
____ Others			

6. LEP students in district:

____ Total
____ Elem (including K)
____ Middle/JHS
850 High schools: 40 - 45 % LEP
____ Vocational
____ Alternative:
____ Others

Note: percent of LEP students calculated from 4. & 6.

7. District personnel involved with LEP students: no data

	Teachers	Administrators	Paraprofessional
____ Total			
____ Elem (including K)			
____ Middle/JHS			
____ High schools			
____ Vocational			
____ Alternative			
____ Others			

Note: include percent of involvement (e.g., quarter time, 50%, etc): data not available

Student Teacher Ratio = 27 to 1 in Nogales High given in report.
A number of teachers must be part-time, because 1800 students with 88 teachers yields a STR of 20.5.

8. Minority languages represented among students in the district: Spanish

   5% Anglo (white) and 1% black, Asian, Indian and others.
   The majority of the students entering the school system (K-12) for the first time are monolingual Spanish speakers.

9. Country of birth : Data not available

	Number of Students
United States	
Mexico	
Central America	
South America	
Caribbean	
Others (reflected in the language groups above)	

10. SES level of students in the district:

    31% of the families in Nogales have incomes below the poverty level.

    Based on: Information not given in the report.

11. Parental information (percent):

    Occupation: ____laborers ____skilled workers __9__professional
    Large numbers are skilled workers.

    Education: ____less than HS ____HS graduates __12__ college grads
    51% of the parents have completed 12 years or less of schooling

    Income level: __31__ below poverty

12. Other pertinent information about the district:

    Standardized test achievement: __X__ Below ____ Approx. same ____ Above
    Consistently below the national norm in the basic skills area.

    Attendance rates: 97.5% (100 day report, 1990-91 school year)

    Mobility rates: no data

    Retention rate: 91%

    Career (%):

About 15 ___	Enter workforce right after graduation
Fewer than 5	Joined armed forces
Over 75 ___	Trade school, college or university

    Honor program:
    International Baccalaureate program for the academically gifted students

Student recognition programs:
VIP (Very Important Apache) and Student of the Month

Enrichment programs (e.g., art and music): No data available

Bilingual program: extensive

Business:	Typing for monolingual Spanish speaker Bilingual Secretarial Skills ESL I, II, III (3, 2 and 1 hour of English class respectively) LEP English I, II, III
Spanish:	Intn. Baccalaureate Eng III and IV for the Spanish native Speakers (AP) Spanish Level I and II - emphasis on English objectives
Social Studies:	World History, American History in Spanish for ESL Students World History, American History in Spanish for LEP Students
Mathematics:	Pre-Algebra, Algebra I, Algebra II - in Spanish for ESL Students
Science:	Biology I in Spanish for ESL students LEP Biology for LEP students
Counseling:	Two fully Bilingual Counselors
Library:	Material purchased for monolingual Spanish speakers and LEP students
Reading:	Bilingual reading specialist offers 1 class on IBM Computer Reading Lab for ESL students.
Student activities:	$130,000 budget for coaches and club sponsored addendum at the high school level; one part-time Assistant Athletic Director; clubs such as the French Club, Computer Club, Key Club, etc.

Student personnel service:

Four full time counselors, one school nurse, two part-time student advocates and one full-time drug education instructor; career center provides career information, guidance information regarding colleges, financial aid information and computers for student use.

School improvement activities:

Professional days for teachers to attend workshops or visit other schools; continuing education through college courses; inservice on curriculum matters

Library and media program:

$42,000 budget with over 35,000 volumes or more than 19 volumes per student; audio-visual specialist

Athletics: no available data

Community relations: no data

Community characteristics:

The major sources of employments are tourism, export and import trace and government services. Strong cultural and religious background in community, with the family unit an integral part of the fabric. Community pride is very high.

Program Features

Theoretical Framework: Curriculum designed to accommodate all students.

Mission Statement: "We believe that all students are capable of learning and can be successful. We believe that all students need the opportunity to succeed and to have the opportunity to make choices. We believe that all students can learn to be responsible, learn self-respect and respect for others. We believe that all students are capable of problem solving and have the ability to become leaders as well as followers.

We believe that teachers cause learning. We believe that teachers are a positive influence in the lives of students and can help them acquire self-confidence.

We believe that Nogales High School can and will provide a positive atmosphere for learning that will enable every student to have a basic foundation of academic skills. We believe that through a challenging and diverse curriculum, Nogales High School will provide equity to all students."

Goals and Objectives:

One of the major goals of the District is that standardized achievement test scores forall students will be at or above grade level.

Information on LEP Students in program: 40-45% LEP in district.

13. Number of LEP students in program: Insufficient data

_____Total

____ Pre-K to K+

____ Elementary

____ JHS/Middle School

850 HS

____ Vocational

____ Alternative

____ Others

14. Minority languages represented in program: Presumed to be the same as Question 8.

15. Countries of birth represented in program: Reflected in #8

Program Characteristics

16. Extensiveness of program:

___ District-wide program (Program serves several schools)

_X_ School-wide program (All classes at a school contain LEP students in program): All grade levels in Nogales High School

___ Partial school program (A portion of the grades participate in the program)

___ Self-contained instruction (All instruction is provided in the classroom)

___ Ungraded (Many age levels frequently in the same instructional setting)

___ Graded (Students of same age always in the same instructional setting)

___ Pull-out instruction (LEP students receive some instruction outside the classroom)

___ Other

9-12 Grade level(s)/within a school (include grade levels)

17. How English language development is provided:

_X_ ESL instruction (Formal ESL instruction is provided as a separate instructional period)

___ English language development instruction

___ Sheltered English (English proficiency is developed using English as the medium for providing comprehensible content area instruction)

___ Integrated English instruction (English development is integrated into content instruction)

___ English immersion (Teachers are fluent in students' native language(s), but instruct only in English)

_X_ Computer support (Some English is taught using CAI): One class on IBM Computer Reading LAB for ESL students

___ Individualized instruction (IEPs are developed for individual students and formulate the basis for developing English proficiency)

___ Special textbooks/instructional materials are provided (for example, AGP Holt Math program, Houghton Mifflin Series Reading Program, ELEPS)

___ Literature based program

___ Other (please describe)

18. Target content areas:

_X_ Math

Goals and objectives: Students will apply mathematical processes in a variety of areas.

(1) Demonstrate at least one year's growth as evidenced by standardized test scores.

(2) Demonstrate the application of mathematical processes with at least 70% accuracy.

_X_ Writing -

Goals and objectives: All students will increase writing skills

(1) Improve writing skills through an increased emphasis on writing activities across the curriculum.

(2) Be able to use each of the four writing types (descriptive, expository, narrative and persuasive) when appropriate.

_X_ Reading

Goals and objectives: Students will increase reading abilities through implementation of reading across the curriculum.

(1) Increase standardized test scores by 1 grade level per year.

(2) Meet District mandated requirement of achieving 9th grade level or test scores of 40% or higher.

_X_ Speaking

Goals and objectives: Students will be able to communicate using English with average fluency as compared to native English speakers.

(1) Encourage to speak English daily during classroom activities.

(2) Encourage to speak English when engaged in non-academic, affective activities with peers and teachers.

_X_ Listening

Goals and objectives: Students will increase their formal or cognitive listening skills

(1) Increase TAP scores in all areas

___ Social Studies - none

Goals and objectives:

___ Language Arts - none

Goals and objectives:

___ Science - none

Goals and objectives:

19. Affective areas:

Goals and objectives: Students will show positive participation in the areas of responsibility, motivation, and self-concept.

(1) Responsibility - Attend classes more frequently, come to class on time, come to class prepared, and have respect for school property.
(2) Self-concept - Increase positive participation in school programs and increased participation in club and athletics.
(3) Motivation - Will study and get involved more

20. Salient and unique features (list the features that distinguish this program and contribute to its uniqueness):

A large number of students are involved in this program with several of the key areas required for effective learning addressed. In addition, there is an affective component to improve the motivation and self-concept of the students.

21. Trends and future agenda - emerging themes:

The curriculum is designed to accommodate all students. It is expected that successful components will be extended to the entire student body. Learning from the experience of implementing the present program, improvement and modification of the program will be carried out.

Curriculum Characteristics:

22. Number of classes offered : data not available

____ Total
____ Pre-K to K+
____ Elementary
____ JHS/Middle
____ HS
____ Vocational
____ Alternative:
____ Others

23. Types of classes offered:

_X_ Language - Mode of delivery: unknown
Whole language: AP Spanish
_X_ ESL : Increases from 9 to 37 in 3 years (increase of 400% since 1988).
_X_ LEP English
_X_ Social Studies
_X_ Mathematics
_X_ Science
_X_ Reading
_X_ Business
____ Other

24. Materials used in curriculum:

_X_ Special collection of problems (e.g., practical math problems): A criterion referenced math quiz

_X_ Guides for teachers

_X_ Manuals for students (e.g., style manuals in writing) : Style manuals in preparation of research papers

_X_ Special library collections : A bibliography of math materials: books, visuals

___ Other

Student Characteristics and Performance

Student Characteristics:

Note: For each program area - cognate and affective questions 26, 27, and 28 must be answered separately because different approaches and selection methods are adopted by the overseeing committees.

25. Population of students from which selection is made:

Math
_X_ The entire student body including LEP students
___ All LEP students

Writing
_X_ The entire student body including LEP students
___ All LEP students

Reading
___ The entire student body including LEP students
_X_ All LEP students

Speaking
___ The entire student body including LEP students
_X_ All LEP students

Listening
_X_ The entire student body including LEP students
___ All LEP students

Affective
_X_ The entire student body including LEP students
___ All LEP students

26. Selection methods and entry requirements for participation in program:

Math
_X_ Random selection from population : 100 from each class
_X_ Selection by teachers and/or administrator : entire school population
___ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Writing
_X_ Random selection from population : 200 students
___ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
___ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Reading
____ Random selection from population
_X_ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
_X_ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests): score of 40% or lower on standardized tests, district reading assessment, IPT, home language

Speaking _X_ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
_X_ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests): 10% of the LEP classes randomly selected from the English classes.

Listening _X_ Random selection from population : representative cross-section
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

Affective _X_ Random selection from population
____ Selection by teachers and/or administrator
____ Additional requirements (e.g., 40% or lower in stand.tests)

27. Control group for comparison:

Math ____ Yes _X_ No
Writing ____ Yes _X_ No
Reading ____ Yes _X_ No
Speaking _X_ Yes ____ No : Control group is 10% of regular English classes.
Listening ____ Yes _X_ No
Affective ____ Yes _X_ No

Student Performance:

28. Length of supporting data:

____ Two years
_X_ Three or more years

29. Evaluation Effectiveness:

___ Comparative data (e.g., with entire student body or control group) : lacking
_X_ Longitudinal data (e.g., TAP score of LEP students)
_X_ Objective standards (standardized tests or state tests)
_X_ Subjective standards (e.g., teacher evaluation) : frequently used
___ Other (e.g., library request frequency) : lacking; used as a part of reading evaluation.

Note: Varies in each sub-area of program.

30. Length of time in program: Academic year

31. Educational outcomes: Data from Nogales High attached at the end of this report.

_X_ Gains in academic performance

How measured: ITBS(TAP) scores; committee designed math quiz

Math: Scores are provided by year 1985-91.
It indicates 9.1 months average growth in 1991.

How measured: Written essays by students; Teachers' subjective report

Writing: Steady decline in writing sample scores from 1987 to 1990. Last year's sample showed a modest improvement. Data is based on a random sampling of 200 students out of the population. Conclusion of committee is that objective of the program has yet to be met.

How measured: TAP scores; reading requirement for graduation; library circulation record; comparison of reading comprehension score for student body.

Reading: Scores are provided by year 1985-91.
LEP test scores are not increasing. However, test scores for entire student body is increasing (13.3 months average growth). Moving into phase two which incorporates critical thinking skills and other skills such as research skills.

How measured: Teacher evaluation

Speaking: Data are provided by year 1988-91. See attached.

How measured: TAP scores; teacher developed listening test

Listening: Scores are provided by year 1987-91(pending).
There is an indication of increase in overall scores. The average score on teacher developed test was 24.98 out of 40 in 1989 and 24.52 in 1990. This is considered as a sign of an improvement due to an increase of larger number of LEP and ESL student population. Teachers felt that the Speaking and Listening programs should be combined.

32. Affective outcomes:

How measured: Baseline data; ITBS scores

Attendance rates: Increased by 2.9 % (94.6% in 1989-90 vs. 97.5% in 1990-91)

Drop out rates: Decreased by 2% from 11% down to 9 %

Honor roll: 41 additional students in first semester of 1990 (250 students in first semester of 1989-90 vs. 291 students in first semester of 1990-91)

Graduation rates: Projected to increase from 328 in 1990 to 360 in 1991 for a net gain of 32. Percentage rates of graduation are 94.5 % (328 out of 347) in 1990 versus 97.3 % (360 out of 370) for an increase of 2.8 %.

Instructional Features

33. Instructional strategies:

_X_ "Regular" classroom instruction (with no specialized instruction)

_X_ Team teaching (Two or more teachers/aids are responsible for instruction in the same classroom)

____ Peer teaching (Older students with more English proficiency work with LEP students to provide translation)

____ Cooperative grouping (Instructional activities require that students collaborate to produce a common product)

____ Individualized instruction (IEPs and other strategies are used to individualize instruction for students)

____ Language experience approach (Reading, writing, speaking, and listening are aught interactively building on students' experiences as basis for language learning experiences)

____ Small group instruction (Students are grouped for instruction along with varying criteria which are instructionally related)

_X_ Laboratory instruction (Students are provided variety of environment in a single laboratory for learning skills and content. e.g., computer-assisted-instruction)

____ Community resources (Resources from outside the school, including volunteers, are tapped to provide instructional support)

____ Other

34. Plan design:

_X_ Overseeing committees

_X_ Staff development and activities for teachers (e.g., teaching strategies)

_X_ Relevance to other curriculum areas

_X_ Shared responsibilities (among all segments: teachers, adm., etc)

_X_ Timeline for goals to be accomplished

35. Learning skills and strategies:

____ Metacognitive strategies

____ Critical thinking skills

_X_ Student-self evaluation

_X_ Test-taking strategies

____ Research skills

Instructional personnel:

36. Training and support: insufficient data

___ Teachers are trained in language development techniques

_X_ Teachers hold state certification for teaching LEP students
Staff at NHS are encouraged to receive an ESL or Bilingual certification. Thirty-six out of 82 classroom teachers are bilingual or LEP certified.

___ Staff development is provided program staff in latest research and methodologies

___ Staff development is regularly provided for mainstream teachers in language development strategies

___ Teachers are provided planning time during the school day

___ Instructional aides (bilingual IAs assist teachers in the classroom)

Remark: "The Nogales High School administration provide ample opportunities for staff to improve their skills," including professional day, and inservice before the school year and throughout the school year.

Support Components

37. Staff characteristics:

__X__ ESL or bilingual certificated

__X__ Speaks language of LEP students: Fourty-two teachers speak Spanish.

__X__ Continuing inservice training

METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocol

Central Elementary School, San Diego City Schools, California

March 1992

School District Context:

1. **Locale:** Southwest

2. **No. students in district:** over 100,000

3. **No./level of schools in district:** 112 Elem (including K)/19 Middle/JHS 1 k-12/4 4-12

4. **Total No. LEP students in the district: ____(based on 1991 data bical)**

   Total LEP Enrollment/1987 - 16,069
   Total LEP Enrollment/1988 - 17,265
   Total LEP Enrollment/1989 - 19,402
   Total LEP Enrollment/1990 - 22,321
   Total LEP Enrollment/1991 - 25,035

5. **Percent of total student population in the district who are LEP: 20.7%**

6. **Minority languages represented among students in the district:** Spanish, Vietnamese, Laiotian, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Chinese, Farsi, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, Arabic, Portuguese, other.

7. **Foreign Countries represented among students in the district:** reflected in the language groups stated above.

8. **SES level of students in the district:** Reflects the variety found in large urban settings. For students at this school, their community is described as having a 94% mobility rate, and economically deprived (June 19, 1991 correspondence from principal, Louise Martin).

9. **Other pertinent information about the district:** The district is located in a large urban area, 25 miles from the Mexican border. It has experienced years of integrating the children of immigrants, sometimes in the U.S. illegally. The district has been recognized (nationally) for its bilingual education programs and for the leadership it and surrounding districts have provided to the rest of the country in programs for Spanish-speaking LEP students, as well as those from other minority language backgrounds. A recent event which attracted large numbers of other language groups to the district was the location of one of the first major Southeast Asian relocation centers at the nearby Miramar Marine training base. This contributed in large, the growing numbers of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Hmong children in the district.

The district has implemented a desegregation plan, which created a number of magnet schools, as well as a variety of organizational variations. As a result, school district personnel were used in the process of restructuring instructional programs designed to address the needs of a diverse student population.

10. **Pertinent information about the site:** Central Elementary School is lcoated in east San Diego. The neighborhood is described as a "mix of single-family dwellings, apartments, and commercial homes." The school site is 61 years old, originally designed to accommodate 350 students, instead of 1104 (based on 1991 data) that it currently serves. The building includes an auditorium (also serves as a classroom and the library/media center), a cafeteria, nurse's office,

and administrative offices. There are 15 classrooms located on the site. While 23 of the classrooms are used for instruction, the other 3 are used for the teachers' lounge, counseling center, and resource/primary language room. Further, there are 23 bungalows which are located on the perimeter of the playground. Finally, due to the large student population, an annex is located for fourth and fifth grade children at the neighboring Wilson Middle school site. The school site underwent remodeling during 1991, at that time in order to help address the over-crowded conditions.

The school began a process of restructuring five years ago. At that time, Central began an intensive "internal" staff development program, in order to begin a process of shared management. This includes classified, certified staff and parents. During this time, school improvements that benefit the children have been made. Budgets were reallocated to special programs and waivers to implement innovative programs. Their "shared management governance structure" has allowed members of this school community to continue a process for on-going program review and renewal. Within this process, the school has been able to build support into the school program, as a way of accommodating their extremely diverse population "within the constructs of traditional education" (Page 3, correspondence from Part 2: School Level Section of Proposal - Overview). Staff believe that "education as it is presently structured is failing our children, attempting to mold them to outdated ideals that leave them forever on the outside looking in. Instead, we must create a learning environment that is molded to the makeup of our students, that builds upon their inherent strengths, and engages them -- and their teachers and parents -- in rich, powerful, and meaningful learning experiences."

The school philosophy that has been formulated throughout this process of restructuring states that all children can learn and "show academic progress each year." The major goals of the academic program include:

- quality, integrated learning experience;
- staff committed to provide an educational program to meet the student needs in order for them to achieve at their highest potential;
- school efforts are focused on academic learning, emotional growth, and social interaction;

The school vision statement is:

> In recognition of the highly diverse, highly mobile student population, it is essential to restructure the curriculum and school program to improve student achievement in reading, language, and mathematics. Restructuring should provide more intensive time on task, furnish enrichment opportunities not otherwise available to Central students, and help make up time for students who have had no prior formal education. This restructuring should result in improved test scores, increase student literacy in English, and enable students to compete with all students at the middle level.

Now in the fifth year of a restructuring process, Central Elementary functions as a five-part governance body which is responsible for site-based decision making. In other words, school recommendations and decisions are based on consensus. The body makes changes and decisions consistent with Board policy, legal mandates, and contract language (unless waivers are obtained). In this process, a steering committee is elected. This committee includes parents, teachers, support staff, aides, classified employees, and administrators. They report directly to the site staff. Their recommendations may be concerned with (but not limited to) instruction, curriculum, student assignment, reassignment and deployment, supply needs, and budget items that relate to restructuring and staff reorganization. Job-alike groups (composed of site staff) and parents, make recommendations for restructuring in the same areas described for the steering committee. They have authority to make recommendations for change to the steering committee and site staff. Job-alike groups include support staff, k-2, 3-5, classified, aides and SSC (parents). Task committees include volunteers with representatives from each of the job-alike categories. They report to the

steering committee and operate for the duration of a task, until completion. They make recommendations in areas identified by SCC, job-alikes, site staff, and others. Like the job-alike groups, they propose recommendations for change to the steering committee and total school staff. The School site council (SCC) functions according to state statute and district guidelines. It proposes changes regarding the restructuring vision statement and other efforts associated with the process. Members include an administrator, parents, classified staff, community aides, and teachers.

Central Elementary school, through the process of restructuring been able to:

- •identify new programs and activities;
- •develop a new instructional model combining four alternativeprograms to meet students' special needs;
- •implemented an alternative extended-year schedule;
- •included the total staff in staff development days for inservice on curriculum, team building, curriculum management, teaching and learning styles, etc;
- •gained experience in assessing and prioritizing programs to maximize resources.

Program Context

11. Grade levels involved in the site: Pre-School and K-5

12. Ethnic Distribution:
(Based on data from School Profile, Area IV, April 1991)

	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
Hisp.	30.4	26.1	27.2	3.3	37.5	43.5
Wh.	23.2	20.0	18.0	15.1	12.5	11.2
Af.Am.	19.3	21.4	21.0	18.5	22.0	17.8
Asian	1.1	1.1	1.4	2.2	2.3	1.8
Pac.Is.	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.1
Fil.	1.6	1.2	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.5
IndoCh.	24.3	30.0	31.0	30.0	25.1	24.9
Nat.Am.	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2

13. Total number of LEP students at the site. Out of a total 1104 students, 700 are identified as limited English proficient. 23 differentlanguages are represented at this school. 62% of the students are limited-English proficient.

14. Minority languages represented at the site: Spanish, Filipino, Vietnamese, Hmong.

15. Foreign countries represented among students at the site: (Mexico, Central America, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam).

16. SES level of students at the site: This school has a 94% mobility rate in a economically deprived community. 80% of the students are latch-key children. 92% qualify for free or reduced lunch and 91% of the families receive AFDC payments. Central is the second poorest school in the district. According to the school level section of proposal, some children stay

home because they do not have clean clothes to wear. This school has a 94.8% mobility index -- student transfers are constant. Many of the students who enter Central Elementary are new to the U.S. As immigrants, they enter at grades 2, 3, 4 or 5, sometimes with no previous formal education experience. This community is characterized by multiple-family dwellings. Using district criteria, 150 students at Central are considered to be at risk.

17. General Description of the nominated program: The program that currently exists at Central Elementary is based on a vision that all children can learn, "given enough time and a supportive learning environment.:

> In recognition of the highly diverse, highly mobile student population, it isessential to restructure the curriculum and the school program to improve student achievement in reading, language, and mathematics. Restructuring should provide more intensive time on task, furnish enrichment opportunities not otherwise available to Central students, and help make-up time for students who have had no prior formal education. This restructuring should result in improved test scores, increase student literacy in English, and enable students to compete with all students at the middle level.
>
> (Taken from Part 1: School Level Section of Proposal).

Central Elementary identifies three "daring departures" from the traditional educational model. These departures are designed to help realize the goal of success for all students. They include:

> •Instructional Model - Four alternative programs are available, designed to help meet students' specific needs. Accordingly, students begin their day in a home room (integrated by ethnicity and gender) for opening activities, including journal writing. After this period, students participate (physically move) to one four instructional programs: regular (English), Spanish, sheltered or transition. This instructional period is referred to as "core time." During this period students receive instruction in reading (or English), math, social studies, language, spelling, and science.

Note: During this instructional period, students receive either the district-developed Achievement Goals Program (AGP) or an adaptation.

> Placement in the four programs is determined by student's level of Englishproficiency. In the afternoon, students return to their homeroom for English language instruction in fine arts, p.e. Once a week, students participate in a library program, which stresses library skills, computers and music. This 1 hour block of period allows the teacher one hour of "prep time."

•Eleven Month School Year

Staff at Central Elementary decided and agreed to change their contracted work schedule that will provide an additional 24 learning days. This was done in an effort to accommodate the major components of the schools vision statement (i.e., additional time on task, program enrichment, expansion and reinforcement of the curriculum, and improvement of test scores). In this extended school year plan, the primary instructional blocks (totaling the mandated 180 day school year) are combined with four interim sessions. These interim sessions take the place of the present 120 hour summer school, adding 24 days of instructional time to the students school year. During interim sessions, students are involved in an enrichment that provides assistance to students in improving basic skills, as well as opportunities for them to apply their learning in practical situations. Activities include both classwork and field experiences. All students attend the extra 24 days. Site monies were reallocated to fund the additional costs.

•Alternative Reading Program Adoption

During the 1989-90 school year, 13 of the classes from the sheltered, transition, and regular programs participated in the district's pilot reading program. Houghton Mifflin was selected by teachers, as it was felt that it best met their needs. It was necessary for the school to obtain school board permission to undertake this adoption, as it differed with the district committees selection (which adopted another program). This is critical to understand, in that, the school staff voluntarily assumed a larger responsibility because district resources would not be available.

In terms of the schools thinking and philosophy in this area, they state that:

> In particular, we need to do a better job of eliminating "failure"in the early grades and providing learning experiences that address a broad spectrum of learning styles and abilities."

The following major improvement areas, which the school will concern itself with include:

•**Primary Grades** - Many of the recent immigrants coming into the school, arrive with little to no formal educational experience, as well as being limited English proficient. With this in mind, the school is proposing to enforce a nongraded system, designed to give these students an increased amount of time to learn, presumably, at their own pace. Issues involved in planning this program include the establishment of criteria for success (skills to be learned), designing activities appropriate to different student learning styles, and helping students adjust to a new culture and the school environment.Within this structure, the staff is operating under an undergirding premise that traditional academic curriculum currently in use is not effective for many of the inner-city students. It is believed that for all children to successfully meet state and district objectives, the regular curriculum must be supplemented with alternative units (e.g., AIMS Math/Science).

In this situation, students in the nongraded classroom cluster would be evaluated and placed in each subject area group based on learning style, need, and learning experience.

Other areas to be developed include the development of students' critical thinking skills and their ability to apply knowledge to new, meaningful situations.

•**Entry Level Class** - Staff is investigating the possibility of establishing a short-term "entry level class" for immigrant students. Over a period of 1 - 2 weeks, students would spend time being introduced to the educational opportunities and responsibilities at Central. Further, this period of time would allow for a more accurate and reliable placement of many of the LEP students. In this sense, it will function as a very short-term "welcome center."

•**Special Education** - Central Elementary services 45 learning handicapped and 60 gifted students. To ensure that the needs of all students are being addressed, staff has proposed that gifted and learning handicapped students be integrated into the instructional program.

•**Parent Education/Preschool** - Staff is planning (as part of the parenting program) a preschool for four-year olds, who, presumably, will one day enter Central School. This will provide an opportunity to develop students readiness skills and will help promote effective parenting skills.

•**Instructional Improvement** - Through the schoolwide instructional program, the staff has been able to strengthen several programs. First, instructional aides have received extensive training in the reading program; in the area of skills development, a writing and thinking program has been implemented; teachers have received training in the writing process through Writers' Forum; a Family Math program has been implemented in Spanish and English. Further, all students participate in a Wednesday Revolution Program, which is a literature-based reading program, as a motivation for students to read for pleasure.

•**Literature Based English Language Arts** - this program is used in all regular and bilingual/transition classes. Additionally, the Silver Burdett Social Studies series, district science, health, p.e., and fine arts programs are used. The sheltered and Spanish bilingual classes implement the ELEPS program, developed by teachers in the district. The sheltered classes use the "Making a New Life in America" social studies program.

•**Second Language Program** - Central Elementary School receives extra funds for the implementation of the Second Language Education Program. Monies are provided to contribute to the costs for programs in order to ensure equal educational opportunity to LM/LEP students. Spanish speaking students receive reading, language, and math instruction in Spanish, until they master English, to participate fully in the mainstream English program. For those children whose first language is not Spanish (Vietnamese, Cambodian) students identified as LEP receive some instruction in their L1.

•**Primary Language Program** - This lab is conducted by three instructional aides. From 8:30 - 3:00 p.m. students receive instruction in Social Studies in their L1 (23 languages).

18. Funding history: The Chapter 1, Compensatory Education Program is funded through the Education Consolidation Improvement Act (ECIA), which is supplemental funding. Central is designated as a schoolwide project school as the required criteria has been met. All students are now project participants eligible to receive the services of the following:

•site resource specialist
•library/media center
•reinforcement program
•counseling center
•additional health services
•AGP/compensatory education resource teacher
•computer lab
•physical education program

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation Improvement Act provices funds for supplementary instruction in the basic skills. The district has also allocated some Chapter 1 funds and some regular district funds to this program referred to as BSSAP. Small group instruction is given to three to five students within each group. Students receive thirty minutes of direct instruction by assistant instructors, or, reinforcement by the instructional aides. The Basic Skills Supplemental Assistance Program operates from 2:00 - 3:30 p.m. The reinforcement materials included in the AGP math programs are used.

In addition to the district curriculum, Central Elementary functions as a School Based Coordinated Program (SBCP) which provides a variety of programs and services designed to meet individual student needs. This structure permits consolidation of many of the state funded categorical programs at the school level into one total program. The Central SBCP allows teachers and other school staff, administrators and parents, the opportunity to work as a unit, in the design and implementation of a program that addresses the needs of all children, rather than focuses on separate funding sources. This has allowed Central Elementary to be student-focused, using school categorical resources to ensure success for each of the students, toward accessing the district's core curriculum.

Program Characteristics:

19. How students are served:

•District-wide program (Program serves several schools) This program is part of a schoolwide restructuring initiative, which to date, involves up to 30 schools from the elementary, middle/junior high and senior high school levels);

•School-wide program (All classes at school are involved in the restructuring process which is designed to impact all students);

•Ungraded (Some of the classes are designed to accommodate students across several grade levels, e.g., immigrant "welcome" class; primary grade class designed to prepare students who have not had formal educational experience).

•Other (students interact with one another, regardless of gender, ethnicity, dominant language) at some given point in the instructional day.

20. Instructional Strategies Utilized:

____	**Team teaching**
____	**Peer teaching**
____	**Cooperative Learning**
_X_	**Individualized Instruction**
____	**Language Experience approach**
_X_	**Small group Instruction**
_X_	**Laboratory Instruction**
_X_	**Community Resources**
____	**Other**

21. Instructional Personnel: 37 teachers comprise the K-5 staff at Central Elementary School. Of this, 10 classes are designated as Spanish, 1 English, 1 Vietnamese, 10 sheltered, 12 regular and 3 transition.

Itinerant teaching staff includes 1 speech therapist, 2 resource teachers, 1 resource specialist, 1 speech therapist (annex), 1 psychologist, 1 nurse, 1 outreach counselor, 1 adapted p.e. teacher, 1 district counselor, 1 district counselor, 1 media prep time teacher, 1 drama/music prep. time teacher.

Classified staff consists of 1 clerk typist, 1 building services supervisor, 1 school clerk, 1 custodian, 1 I.A. assigned to the counseling center, 1 general school secretary, 1 Health Aide, 4 general I.A.s, 1 I.A. assigned to the health office, 1 I.A. assigned to the computer room, 1 I.A. assigned to the resource specialist, 1 assigned to the computer room, 1 guidance aide, 1 clerk typist, 1 school clerical assistant.

Staff Development

Staff at Central Elementary have been involved in ongoing staff development. Key themes addressed during these meetings included whole language, writing process, guidance/special education referrals, portfolio assessment, student discipline, ungraded classrooms, school reconstruction planning, library reading program, testing program, holistic scoring for writing, new reading adoption, use of classroom aide, classroom organization for the new Spanish reading program, teaching strategies (cooperative learning, partner work, reciprocal teaching), Math Their Way, classroom math activities, use of math manual, use of math framework, to name a few.

22. Community Involvement: Members of the school community are involved in the site based management process at Central Elementary. Moreover, the school provides a parenting program and family outreach. For example, to assist children and their families, the school joined with 8 other schools in the Mid-City area. Together, they fund an outreach counselor who works with students and families most critically in need of counseling or assistance from community efforts. The project has resulted in more effective access to a network of community resources which had been out of reach . Finally, the school has estabished a home/reading program where library books are sent home to reinforce reading skills and motivate children to read at home, with their parents.

23. Student Performance

GRADED 3	Reading					Written Language					Mathematics					Bkgrd Factors #	
Yr Ending	86	87	88	89	90	86	87	88	89	90	86	87	88	89	90	SEI	% LES
School	284	262	283	247	239	271	266	299	262	265	273	265	294	259	255	1.16	49.1
District	287	289	297	294	285	294	297	303	297	292	289	292	293	288	288	1.95	21.3

Year	At-Risk @	Retained@
1986-87	30.1	11.7
1987-88	22.3	8.6
1988-89		
1989-90		

Examining Performance

Central staff meet regularly to study and discuss problems and solutions toward improving student achievement and test results. In addition to test scores and teacher evaluation, Central has instituted a schoolwide portfolio assessment program. A committee has developed criteria for assessing the school-wide program. This may include portfolios, checklists, report cards, and tests.

24. Attendance

	Enrollement		Attendance					Suspensions		Transience	
Year	K-12	Pre-K	Absences	Nonapp	% Nonapp	Actual Att.	% ADA	Total	Rate	Mobility Index	Percent Stable
1985-86	641	0	8,205	1,959	23.88	92.89	98.30	49	7.64		
1986-87	721	0	9,861	946	9.59	92.40	99.27	37	5.13	89.9	73.6
1987-88	838	0	10,553	2,635	24.97	92.83	98.21	27	3.22	78.9	73.4
1988-89	877	0	12,623	2,143	16.98	92.05	98.56	45	5.13	94.8	70.3
1989-90	948	0	12,798	1,447	11.31	92.08	99.10	60	6.10		
1990-91	1,049	0									

+Rates per 100 students enrolled

25. Theoretical Framework of Program: The main feature that undergirds this restructuring process is the belief that all children can learn and progress academically, regardless of age, gender, ses, level of proficiency in English or primary language. The philosophy of the school shows that:

All children can learn and show academic progress each year. The major goal of Central's academic program is a quality, integrated learning experience. The staff is committed to provide an educational program to meet the needs of students in order for them to achieve at their highest potential. School efforts are focused on academic learning, emotional growth, and social interaction. (School Program Summary, 1991)

26. Goals and Objectives: Within the area of learning and thinking, the staff and community of Central Elementary have identified four "vital and not insignificant changes" that will be made in the way students are taught. In an effort toward creating a learning environment that stimulates academic and personal growth amongst all children, taking into account different learning styles, language background, etc., students will be enabled to acquire knowledge and skills "at their own pace without experiencing failure in the early grades." The four vital components in this change process are:

1. Students can take up to four years to complete criteria for k-3. Because of the diversity found at this school (ranging from learning handicapped to highly gifted, the program is restructured to ensure that these students engage in appropriate learning experiences, without isolating them from the mainstream school population. Staff believe that this structure will promote integration of various children (e.g., gifted and talented, limited English proficient, learning handicapped, and regular).

2. The Central program will allow more integration of instructional types. Within the context of LM/LEP students, staff has found that initially, in the first days of school, much of the time is taken up with orientation, testing and placement, language differences and the time it takes to introduce the student/s to a new setting and culture. Staff have proposed a short term entry-level class, designed to help prepare immigrant students for instruction.

3. An entry-level class will improve the success rate in placing students in an appropriate academic program. With SB1274, staff wants to ensure that preschool program be put in place. They propose that such a program would prepare 4 year olds and their parents, for future school learning. The intent is to engage the young in stimulating and positive early learning, through collaboration with parents to provide support.

4. Preschool will result in higher level of English language skills earlier and fewer academic and social adjustment problems at school. Aims at parent involvement include events to bring parents into the school as advocates for their children and collaborators in the process of learning.

27. Special Program Features

- vision - focused on rethinking learning and teaching;
- 11 month school year;
- alternative reading program adoption;
- non-graded primary grades (pilot);
- race/human relations program;
- African-American male program;
- motivation and maintenance program
- business partnership;
- family otreach program;
- student support;
- adopt-a-kid;
- home reading program;
- articulation and coordination of programs;

METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocol

The Sheltered English Approach: An Academic Excellence Program

Glendale Unified School District, Glendale, California

March 1992

School District Context:

1. **Locale:** Southwest

2. **No. students in district:** __ Over 100,00 __ 50-100,000 __ 25-50,000 X 5-25,000 __ under 5,000

3. **No./level of schools in district:** 7 Pre-K 19 K-6 ___ K-8 4 7-8 or 9 3 9 or 10-12

Other: 1 continuation high school, development center for multi-handicapped students, orthopedic unit for physically handicapped students

4. **Total No. LEP students in the district:** *

According to the 1989 Spring Data/Bical Report #89-1 and Spring 1991 Data Bical Report:

- *Total LEP for 1987 - 6,827*
- *Total LEP for 1988 - 7,958*
- *Total LEP for 1989 - 9,768*
- *Total LEP for 1990 - 11,402*
- *Total LEP for 1991 - 12,583*

District Ranking by Enrollment of LEP Students - (In County and District Order)

NOTE: Glendale School District ranks #9 with a total LEP enrollment of 12,583 or Spring 1991 out of a total district enrollment of 32,938(based on Spring 1991 Data Bical figures. LEP students comprise 49.4% of the district enrollment.

5. **Percent of total student population who are LEP and Transition:** 49.4%

The percentage of non-English language background students is now 49.4 % of the total district enrollment; Eight elementary schools have greater than the total district percent of non-English language background students (LEP and FEP) at the school. Specifically, the three exemplary sites have:

Edison-87% (New influx of Armenian as fastest growing pop,.but still heavily Sp.) TOTAL LEP 1991 - 583.

Jefferson-TOTAL LEP 1991 = 508 70.8%(mid 70's mainly Anglo/then Hispanics moved in/then Koreans moved in-(1984) Korean/by Spring '87 Korean influx began to slow down/greatest student pop.Spanish,Korean and Armenian student

population is the fastest growing who began arriving at a steadily increasing pace in Spring '88. Enrollment at this site is decreasing/ e.g. last years enrollment was 880 and it is down to 675 this year. This site is now a "sender" school, e.g. it sends children to a "receiver" school. **(How many children are sent?)**

Mann-86.8%(Enrollment - TOTAL LEP 1991 = 1,090)

The LEP population at each school site has increased. Edison, Jefferson and Mann traditionally have been impacted heavily with Hispanic children. Based on recent racial and ethnic surveys, the surrounding communities are undergoing a change due to the influx of Asian and mid-Eastern populations. The students from the project sites are representative of a diverse linguistic background. For example, there are between 10-13 different languages spoken at these schools. The predominant languages at the three sites are Spanish, Armenian, Vietnamese, Korean and Filipino/Tagalog.

6. **Minority languages represented among students in the district:** *Armenian, Spanish, Korean, Tagalog, Arabic, Farsi, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Japanese, Thai, Cantonese, Indonesian, Urdu, Hungarian, German, Italian, Romanian, Gujarati, Assyrian, Chinese, French, Hindi, Ilocano, Malayam, Marathi, Shanghai, Swedish, Czech.*

7. **Foreign countries represented among students in the district:** Reflected in Item 6 above. *Generally, newly arrived immigrants from the Middle East, Asia, Central America, Armenia, Viet Nam, Korea and the Philippines.*

8. **SES level of students in the district:** Middle and lower income SES, depending on the specific student group. For example, the first wave of immigrants to this school district (arriving in the late 70's and early 80's) came largely from a middle class, educated background. This is mainly true for early immigrants of Armenian and Asian backgrounds. This first wave of immigrants also tended to be educated and literate in the native language. However, the second wave (current) wave of immigrants come from a lower/working class SES level. These recent immigrants tend to come from a less educated/literate background than their predecessors. While this is particularly true for the recent influx of Latino/Hispanic immigrant students I am told that this is the case for recent Armenian immigrants as well.

   Accordingly, the LEP population in the project schools reflects the following:

   - newly arrived immigrants from the Middle East, Asia and Central and South America
   - a wide range of proficiency in L1, from non-proficient to complete literacy
   - basically reflect low socio-economic levels

   Specific SES Breakdown for SEA Site's:

Students 4-6	Number Low Income Part	Percentage of Low Income
Edison - 279	238	86%
Jefferson - 333	160	47%
Mann - 450	313	70%

9. **Other pertinent information about the district:** Entire school district is impacted with large numbers of LEP students. 8 of 19 elementary schools, for example, range from 68 - 87 % LEP. Other schools in the district have Transitional Bilingual Education programs, e.g. Spanish/English TBE and Armenian/English TBE.

Program Context

10. Grade levels involved in exemplary instructional program: 4, 5, 6 in 3 schools

11. Total No. LEP students in the exemplary program:

	Grade Level			
	4	5	6	Total
Elem Sch 1	69	69	66	204
Elem Sch 2	40	51	36	127
Elem Sch 3	93	106	76	275
Total	202	226	178	606

12. Minority languages represented in the site: Predominantly Spanish, Armenian, and Korean, *but approximately nineteen languages are represented altogether(e.g. Tagalog, Arabic, Farsi, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Japanese, Thai, Cantonese, Indonesian, Urdu, Hungarian, German, Italian, Romanian, Gujarati, Assyrian, Chinese, French, Hindi, Ilocano, Malayam, Marathi, Shanghai, Swedish, Czech).*

13. Foreign countries represented among students in the site: *Middle East, Asia, Central and South America, Armenia, Mexico, Korea, Philippines, Arabia, Vietnam, Portugal, Japan, Thailand, China, Indonesia, Hungary, Germany, Italy, Romania, India, France, India, Sweden, Czechoslovakia.*

14. SES level of students in the exemplary program:: (for participating 4th, 5th and 6th graders)

NOTE: See Item 8 for a breakdown of students SES in the SAIP.

Elem Sch 1: 86% from low-income homes
Elem Sch 2: 47% from low-income homes
Elem Sch 3: 70% from low-income homes

15. General description of the Exemplary Program:

__ Sheltered English Approach (SEA/SAIP) is the only program provided for LEP students

X There is both a bilingual instructional program and a SEA provided as options for LEP students/NOTE: At one of the sites (Horace Mann), there is a bilingual Spanish/English TBE program in place, mainly grades 1-3. However, TBE Spanish education may be provided through grade five on an "as needed" basis. Further, there is a first grade (and in its' first year) Armenian bilingual program in place at Mann Elementary School. Edison Elementary School offers a TBE program to its' Spanish LEP students, grades K-6. However, most TBE students are enrolled in the early grades, as it is thought that most of the students will transition at the end of the third grade. The Jefferson SEA also offers a TBE program at least through the third grade, with the TBE being offered to older students as needed. Of particular importance is the notion that at several of the sites I observed SEA only classrooms as well as designated TBE classrooms that function as such in the a.m. and then function as SEAs in the p.m. during social studies and science instruction. This particular phenomenon was observed at the Jefferson and Edison .

X There is also a bilingual instructional program, but it is (for the most part) not for the native language groups provided for in the exemplary program/in some instances this is a true statement. For example, at the Horace Mann site, a Spanish/English and

Armenian/English bilingual program is primarily available to primary grade students. However, Spanish and Armenian speaking LEPs in grades 4-6 (at the same school) are involved in the program--basically those older students that were not participants (as primary graders) in TBE.

X The exemplary program is a medial program for students exiting from a TBE into mainstream classrooms (While the exemplary program may function in this manner, it serves a variety of students ranging from non to limited to transitional proficiency)

X In addition to the exemplary site, instruction in content areas also is provided bilingually and in the native language--This is a true statement and I will provide several examples for each of the sites.

NOTE: The Glendale program is multi-functional, serving a variety of students, with different languages, cultures and academic needs.

Edison Elementary School

For example, in one classroom that provides instruction to Spanish speaking LEP students as well as other language groups, Spanish speaking LEP students are sent to another room in the a.m. for Spanish reading, while the classroom teacher conducts sheltered English reading and language arts in the homeroom. When the Spanish speaking LEP's return back to their homeroom, all students receive sheltered (SAIP) instruction in the social studies and science. This particular teacher uses the native language of the Spanish speaking LEP students for comprehension checks during SAIP instruction.

In another, the teacher (Grade 4) who teaches the sheltered "transitional" class. This teacher works with all of the students as students for science and social studies. However, as the teacher translated a particular lesson for a small group of Spanish speaking LEPs, going much beyond (I use the word just a couple of sentences to serve, say, as a comprehension check. Along with teaching the content areas and transitional reading, this particular teacher also provides Spanish reading instruction to the small group of Spanish speaking LEPs.

Fourth grade teacher she conducted a social studies lesson dealing with the Spanish coming to the New World. There was a cross-section of LEP students in this particular classroom. After the teacher briefly introduced the lesson by asking questions like, "Who lived here before any of the explorers?" and "How do you think the Indians felt when the saw the Spanish men (explorers) on their horses?, she quickly dispersed a small group of Armenian LEP students to another location of the room, where they continued to have the remainder of the lesson "translated" into Armenian, by an instructional aide.

Jefferson Elementary School

At this particular site, I observed a fourth grade teacher as she worked with students in cooperative groups. The teacher moved around (continuously) from group to group, asking questions about the order of how the Indians fixed/prepared acorns (for eating). Hence, she was discussing sequencing within the lesson. The students called out answers verbally, and while this was going on, students were also working in their groups, ordering a set of sentence strips with the ":acorn" steps written out on them. As the children worked on this activity, this teacher called out (spontaneously) explanations of the activity in Armenian and then quickly shifted back to English.

In another classroom, I observed as a program teacher taught a lesson on the Vikings. The students were working in small cooperative groups. I noted as the teacher provided

extensive directions in English and then briefly repeated them in Spanish. There were 3 English groups and 2 Spanish speaking groups. The English groups worked in English and the Spanish speaking groups worked in Spanish. As the teacher guided the children to read a page from their book (about the Vikings) (she allowed about 1 minute for reading), she then told them to stop and write down everything they had learned on one sheet of paper--that is, one sheet of paper per each group to record what they had learned. Then, the teacher asked them to "send" the group paper over to the next group. Of particular interest to me was the implication of respect for the languages of the students in this classroom. That is, each group passed their group paper over to the next group, regardless of whether or not it was an English or Spanish group, English or Spanish writing, etc., all written down on the same paper. (If this is difficult to understand, give me a call and I'll try to provide a clearer explanation). Moreover, the students from the two Spanish cooperative groups, (according to an informal conversation with the classroom teacher) receive the same worksheets, same material and same questions as the other groups. The classroom teacher stated to met that while she is a SAIP teacher, she also believes that these two particular Spanish LEP groups are not yet ready for transition and are quite limited in their English vocabulary, so she simply incorporates them into the SAIP, using the same cooperative grouping mechanism, as with the sheltered English speaking students. For the record, the Spanish speaking LEP students who are not yet ready to transition into English, receive Spanish reading instruction and ESL instruction on a daily basis, from this classroom teacher. Moreover, this classroom is staffed with a Spanish speaking instructional aide who moves between the two Spanish LEP students during science/social studies instruction, providing assistance to the students. **There are definitely equity implications for this particular teachers approach.**

Horace Mann Elementary School

In one classroom, an English speaking sixth grade teacher was observed as she taught a lesson on Bhudda. The students were working in cooperative groups. The teacher had shared the picture with the students, providing descriptive information. Then, she asked the children (within their groups) to write down a one sentence description on one sheet of paper--this was a group venture. After, she asked a spokesperson from each group to read their description. Then, in one instance she told a student to "Say it in Armenian," which the student did. The teacher did this several more times, and to be cognizant and sensitive to the culture and language of her Armenian students. As well, she asked Spanish speaking students to "Say it in Spanish." While some of the students appeared somewhat reluctant to say the answer in their primary language, the teacher was clearly attempting to lend equal status and respect for the two minority languages, as the students continued the lesson in this sheltered environment.

After the teacher finished the directed teaching part of the lesson, she told the students, "O.K. you may work with your partners to find the answers to the questions and read quietly or read together, whispering..." Two girls began this task. One of the girls, began to read outloud in English while the other girl looked at her and then at her book. After the girl finished reading a paragraph or two in English, she quickly (and quite naturally) began "reading" (translating?) in Armenian. Her "explanations" were (it appeared to me) quite extensive. As the little girl read, "These gods exist in things of natural beauty...", she quickly reverted to Armenian, while the other student listened and then responded back to the "reader" in Armenian, who then continued reading in English and then explaining/reading/translating in Armenian again. I might classify this pattern (which I observed in varying degrees quite consistently in other classrooms) as a Student as Teacher behavior/Student as primary language assistant/translator or Informal Primary Language Use during specialized program Instruction.

This is a program designed for LEP students at grades 4, 5, and 6 that provides instruction in science, social studies, and health in a Sheltered English environment.
All teachers at grades 4, 5, and 6 in the three project schools participate. In addition, at each school there are 2 Classroom Assistants and an ESL Specialist who articulates program components and activities.

The program operates in a context which provides TBE programs for LEP students whose first language is either Spanish or Armenian, but not for those who speak one of the 17 other minority languages. The SAIP is for both (1) LEP students for whom no TBE exists, and (2) LEP students who are ready to exit a TBE but who are not yet functionally proficient in all-English instructional situations. For this latter group, the SAIP provides a "bridge" between the TBE and mainstream, English-only instruction.

16. Funding history:

X Currently funded as SAIP by Title VII NOTE: 1989-1990 academic year marks the fifth and final year of Title 7 funding for the Glendale SAIP. The Sheltered English Approach Academic Excellence Award (also funded by Title 7) will continue through 1992; the moneys for this project will be used primarily for dissemination of materials and training at a national level; however, more teachers in the Glendale School District will receive some training in the Sheltered English Approach, under the auspices of the Academic Excellence Award.

X Supported by state and local funding - Some of the site Principals will utilize moneys from their respective school budgets, in order to continue implementation of the SEA Program.

_ Supported solely by state and local funding, but previously funded by Title VII

_ Supported by special state funding

_ Supported by other federal funding

_ Collaboratively funded by two or more agencies or sources

The school district has been the recipient of Title VII TBE grants in the past. All three schools in the current program have participated in these.

The Glendale School District has held these Title VII Grants in the past:

- *1985 - 1988 Parent Literacy Program*
- *1985- 1988 Sheltered English Program - Transitional Bilingual Education Grant (3 elementary schools--Edison, Jefferson and Mann).*
- *1988-1989 - Continuation Grant*
- *1985 - 1988 Title VII Preschool Project (served Spanish speaking pre-school children at Columbus School)*
- *1988 - 1989 Continuation Grant (includes Armenian students as well as Spanish speaking)*
- *1982 - 1984 Title VII High School (10-12) Armenian, Korean and Spanish Bilingual Program at 2 schools.*

This project is funded as a Transitional Bilingual Education program by Title VII, but the program functions as a SAIP, designed to meet the needs of a diverse group of LEP students. The SEA (Sheltered English Approach) project provides a transitional program for Spanish and Armenian speaking LEP students exiting from a TBE. For other-language LEP students, it is the only English language development program available for content area instruction, as well as daily ESL instruction to promote English language development.

The program began in the fall of 1985 and was designed to provide sheltered-English instruction in science, social studies, and health to LEP 4th, 5th, and 6th graders. This

year(1989-1990) the program received a Title VII Academic Excellence Grant to disseminate aspects of the program.

17. Other pertinent information about the program:

Program Characteristics:

The **Sheltered English Approach Project (SEA) (SAIP)** is a program designed to address the needs of limited English proficient students in grades 4-6. It is designed to address and provide language and concept development support in the content areas of social studies, science and health. Support is provided through curriculum notebooks with specially designed subject matter materials including vocabulary, concepts, skills along with intensive and on-going staff development in the areas of theory, teaching strategies, and materials using cooperative grouping and the sheltered English concept. Hence, the SEA project includes the following:

a. in-depth training program for project staff (according to informal interviews with program staff, I have learned that this staff development is now open to all interested teachers within the district, through the SEA's **Title VII Sheltered English Approach Academic Excellence Program** which is designed to allow for dissemination of the original SEA (SAIP) program. Dissemination is provided to school districts at the national level. Project staff also prepare and deliver presentations to professionals and decision makers at conferences, professional meetings, etc.

b. modified curriculum for classroom use in social studies and science/along with extra/supplemental materials, e.g. filmstrips, health/science kits, picture files, videos, learning kits e.g. oceans, saving energy, maps.

c. heterogeneous classroom instruction, based on a mix of linguistic proficiency for students who are ready to enter a sheltered setting, an **ungraded language arts program** where students are placed at an appropriate skill level and cross grouped across grades, sheltered students are mixed with fluent English proficient students (FEP) and in some cases, English Only (EO) students depending upon the makeup of the particular class.

The ungraded language arts program is relevant for inclusion in a description of the SAIP setting/s, although it is not a defined component of the SAIP per say. That is, the reading program for all students at the **Jefferson SAIP**, for example, includes an ungraded curriculum for all students, e.g. LEPs, NEPs, FEPs, EOs, where students are placed for language proficiency level, (and in some cases, language of instruction, e.g. Sheltered English or Spanish) and skill level. (Interview with Principal and observations, 10/24/89)

At Edison Elementary School students are involved in a schoolwide reading program. All students are involved, including all levels of language proficiency and dominance, as in the Jefferson SAIP. Students are grouped by language proficiency and skill level. Some students leave their homeroom if necessary in order to receive instruction. (Interview with School Resource Person, 10/23/89). Schoolwide reading occurs every morning from 8:30-11:00 a.m. All teachers and students and resource staff are involved.

Year One

For example, in the case of students in Levels 1-4 of the Idea Kit (Grades K-3) these students are classified as NEP and are basically Armenian speakers or Filipino. These "beginning" level students work at the resource center with the Resource Specialist and an

Instructional Aide. They work in English focusing on English language development skills, with the Resource Specialist utilizing a combination of language experience/pre-reading readiness techniques. (Remember, Spanish speaking NEPs would most likely receive Spanish reading instruction from an appropriate teacher or instructional aide).

Year Two

Other LEP students receive their reading instruction in the classroom, and this is departmentalized, so some students will move to another class for reading and then return to their homeroom. These students receive their reading instruction in English and also receive ESL instruction. The Transitional students (Level 5-6 of the Idea Kit) may consist of either a group of Spanish speakers who are taken into transition more "easily" than their Armenian counterparts, as the Spanish alphabet is the same as the English and these Spanish speakers in the transitional group are grouped together. Armenian "transitional" students are placed in another group for reading instruction, and receive lots of oral language development from a teacher and instructional aide. The stress is on the building of vocabulary, oral language, through lots of language experience activities, since the students are learning a "new alphabet" *--in a sense, the focus is on building the Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) of these children, or survival (and eventually) "conversational" English, so that students can then be introduced to the Roman alphabet and English literacy.*

Year Three

Usually, during a students third year in the schoolwide reading program, a student is introduced to the Basal Reader phase of the program. This serves as a formal introduction to basal reading but is still considered a transitional phase for these students.

18. How students are served:

X **District-wide program** (Program serves several schools)
X **School-wide program** (All classes at a school contain LEP students in program)
NOTE: Based upon interviews with key personnel and project staff, as well as through observation, I am led to believe that the school wide language arts program would qualify as an indicator that all students in a given school site, will in some way interact with one another through the course of a day, whether it is through the schoolwide language arts program or through sheltered activities and heterogeneous grouping.
X **Partial school program** (A portion of the grades participate in the program)
X **Self-contained instruction** (All instruction is provided in the classroom)
NOTE: In some cases this is true, especially where bilingual teachers and instructional aides are utilized to provide sheltered as well as primary language instruction--in other cases, teachers departmentalize the students for instruction in reading and language arts, depending on the language of instruction, level of English language proficiency, academic need. However, for the most part, during SAIP instruction (social studies and science) this period is "self-contained."
X **Ungraded** (Many age levels in the same instructional setting)-Yes, the Sheltered English Approach (SEA) utilizes an ungraded, heterogeneous grouping approach to address the needs of its' student population. Ungraded in terms of grouping students appropriately based on skills development, (and this is the case in the schoolwide language arts program, which is not part of the SAIP, but I believe, works "in concert" with the SAIP and adds to its overall effectiveness.
X **Graded** (Students of same age in same instructional setting)
NOTE: While students are placed in their appropriate grade/age level as their "homeroom" assignment, they may be regrouped for schoolwide language arts and/or sheltered English instruction.

X **Pull-out instruction** (LEP students receive some instruction outside the classroom)
Yes, in some cases Non-English Proficient students are pulled out of the classroom to work with the Resource Specialist on Survival English Skills before they can be expected to successfully function in a sheltered environment. The underlying theme here is that for a student to function in a sheltered environment, s/he must have some basic English survival skills. Further, some students move to other classes during the schoolwide language arts program so that they may be grouped appropriately and some students (especially those receiving L1 instruction in reading and language arts, namely Spanish or Armenian) may leave their homeroom for L1 instruction in the language arts.

Targeted LEP transition students receive daily support in reading, language, vocabulary and concept development in the social studies and science content areas. Assistance includes tutorial sessions provided by two trained bilingual instructional aides at each school; special lessons including cooperative learning; sheltered strategies including hands-on activities; and, as necessary, materials and explanations in L1. All activities are indexed to the specific lessons in school district textbooks for each grade level. Commercial materials used include tapes and filmstrips, video cassettes, globes, transparencies and supplementary workbooks. Picture files developed through the project and keyed to specific social studies and science concepts are used extensively.
Math is taught in L2, as are P.E., art, and music.

19. How English language development (ELD) is provided:

X **ESL instruction** (Formal ESL instruction is provided as a separate instructional period)
NOTE: Yes, this is especially true for Non-English Limited Proficient students who require special Survival English Instruction on a daily basis. This usually occurs on a pull-out basis, with the Resource Specialist and in some cases with the assistance of an instructional aide.

X **Sheltered English** (English proficiency is developed by using English as the medium for providing comprehensible content area instruction) or content based second language learning.

X **Integrated English instruction** (English development is integrated into content instruction)
NOTE: Yes, students receive integrated content area instruction. e.g. language arts skills and activities are integrated into the sheltered English teaching of science, social studies and health. The content areas of ESL, Social Studies, Science, Writing in the Content Area and Literature have also shown strong evidence of utilization of the Sheltered English Approach into daily class instruction. *This extension of the SEA into the other content areas is important to note, in that It has been observed it in all of the exemplary classrooms I have visited, and, as you will recall, the SAIP grant calls for sheltered English only within the Science/Social Science content areas.*

_ **English immersion** (Teachers are fluent in students' native language(s), but instruct only in English)

_ **Computer support** (English is taught using computer assisted instruction)

_ **Individualized instruction** (IEPs are developed for individual students and formulate the basis for developing English proficiency)

Sheltered English is used in the program. This is described as an approach to teaching ESL which uses English as the medium for providing content area instruction while emphasizing development of LEP students' language skills. Principles operating are:

- focus on meaning, not form
- simplified or caretaker speech

- controlled vocabulary
- use of demonstrations, experiments, and hands-on materials

The program builds on a research base (i.e., Savitt, 1985; Krashen, 1985; Parker, 1985; Guzman, 1986; Cummins, 1981, 1984). Principles of second language acquisition theory on which instruction is based include:

- **Natural Language Approach**: ESL instruction which systematically teaches students English through activities focusing on listening, speaking, reading, and writing

- **Cooperative Learning:** a series of teaching strategies in which students work in groups for problem solving situations

- **Language Experience**: language and reading activities produced through students' experiences with the content being taught

- **Sheltered Methodology**: approaches to teaching ESL which use English as the medium of instruction and act as a bridge from ESL to academic mainstream instruction

- **Sheltered Science**: sheltered methodology used to provide instruction in science

- **Sheltered Social Studies**: sheltered methodology used to provide instruction in social studies

20. Instructional strategies utilized:

X **Team teaching** (Two or more teachers are responsible for instruction in the same classroom)
NOTE: Teachers work cooperatively during schoolwide language arts and sheltered English instruction, as they often trade students and serve as sending and receiving teachers. You might want to call this "schoolwide teaming", "cooperative teaming", "schoolwide cooperative teaming", etc.

X **Peer teaching** (Older students with more English proficiency work with LEP students to provide translation)
NOTE: This is an absolutely true statement. Students are placed in heterogeneous groups for sheltered English instruction, and students (though not necessarily "older") with more English language proficiency, serve as translators and "sharers" of information and knowledge to the specific learning situation. This happens as a result of the structure of the classroom lesson/environment, e.g. cooperative grouping, heterogeneous grouping, Much of this peer-teaching/student/student interaction occurs quite informally and spontaneously.

X **Cooperative learning** (Instructional activities require that students collaborate to produce a common product)

_ **Individualized instruction** (IEPs and other strategies are used to individualize instruction for students)

X **Language experience approach** (Reading, writing, speaking, listening are taught interactively building on students' experiences as basis for language learning experiences)

X **Small group instruction** (Students are grouped for instruction along varying criteria which are instructionally related)
NOTE: Yes, students are grouped in a variety of ways, depending on the lesson, type of lesson and specific task to be completed. For example, students may be placed in small cooperative groups for a sheltered English science lesson. Students may be placed heterogeneously, by linguistic competence as well as level of skill (needs/strength) in order to allow for student/student interaction during cooperative group task

accomplishments, where some students assist others (e.g. through language translations, explanations and assistance with a task) in the accomplishment of a task or event.

- _ **Laboratory instruction** (Students are provided variety of environments in a single laboratory for learning skills and content)
- _ **Community resources** (Resources from outside the school, including volunteers, are tapped to provide instructional support)
- X **Tutorial sessions** (Instructional aides or other adults work individually with students)
- X **Special textbooks/instructional materials** are provided

The program uses Sheltered English and Cooperative Learning instructional strategies. Students receive instruction in Science, Social Studies and Health, using this ***"multi-pronged approach."***

Sheltered-English instruction includes the use of realia, manipulatives and a "hands-on" approach in which students are actively involved. Students are encouraged to first answer in English, and, if this is not possible, they may offer input in their own language, or in picture form. During instruction, students are allowed to use their primary language with one another, the classroom teacher, and the instructional aide in order to facilitate comprehension of the content. SAIP teachers use the same social-studies and science texts as those used in the "regular" program. However, this curriculum is augmented through the use of vocabulary-building, cooperative-learning configurations and the development of an extensive picture file, hands-on activities and realia. Moreover, several SAIP teachers were paid to develop content-area lessons that incorporate the use of language.

Cooperative learning is used to group LEP students according to language proficiency and variety of academic ability in order to form configurations to accomplish cooperative/group tasks. Teachers also use flexible grouping in order to meet the needs of all students in an on-going fashion, grouping students into "round tables," "partners," and "discussion groups." All students are expected to interact and communicate during these cooperative-grouping activities. Students are encouraged to work together as collaborators. They are encouraged to "help" one another.

21. Instructional Personnel

- X Teachers are trained in language development techniques
- X Teachers hold state certification for teaching LEP students
- X Staff development is provided SAIP staff in latest research and methodologies
- X Staff development is regularly provided for mainstream teachers in language development strategies.

  NOTE: Yes, at this point (school year 1989-1990) I think we can say that the Sheltered English Approach staff development is now opening up to mainstream teachers within and without the district due to the Sheltered English Approaches recent recognition as an "Academic Excellence Program."
- _ Teachers are provided planning time during the school day
- X Instructional aides (Bilingual aides assist teachers in the classroom)

NOTE: This is true in some, but not all cases. However, it seems to be pretty widespread. (I will get specific information on this)

There are 35 grade 4 through 6 teachers at the three schools, 15 of whom are certificated bilingual teachers. In addition, at each school there are 2 educational assistants and an ESL specialist who provides articulation between the ESL program and classroom instruction. (5 educational assistants are fluent in Spanish and 1 is fluent in Armenian.)

In addition to the personnel described above, support personnel are located at each site to provide assistance to teachers and/or direct services to students. While not all of the support

staff is bilingual in the target languages, numbers are increasing each year. Support personnel services are paid for by Chapter 1, School Improvement, GATE and Educational Impact Aid.

ESL Specialists (Resource Specialists) have these additional responsibilities which support implementation of the Sheltered English Project:

- Provide articulation between ESL program and sheltered content program
- Participation in formation of heterogeneous classrooms by providing placement information
- Provide demonstration lessons in project classrooms along with project supervisor and mentor teachers
- Help coordinate distribution of materials

22. Community involvement

X Parent advisory committee
_ Parents as volunteers
_ Evening ESL classes offered to parents
_ Home visits made by bilingual community liaisons
X Open house for parents to learn about program (NOTE: At the beginning of each school year, parents receive a letter from each school explaining the sheltered program and provide parents with the opportunity to visit the school and sheltered English classrooms, at which time any questions may be answered.

Student performance:

23. Evidence of exceptional LEP student performance in:

The project has achieved overall high achievement in oral language skills, reading, and language expression. Based on three years of standardized testing, students have shown exceptional achievement progress as evidenced by post-test grade equivalents. Claims of effectiveness are directly related to the stated goals and objectives of the project.

X Relative gains in English proficiency
How measured:

Summary for 3 years: Objective of the project for this goal was met by Year 3, both overall and at each grade level.

1. 1985-56: Language Assessment Scales (LAS) results: Growth was large, substantial, and statistically significant (see Table I in Appendix).
2. 1986-87: Oral English Language Skills Mastery results: Growth for all grade levels was large, substantial, and statistically significant (see Table II in the Appendix).
3. 1986-87:IDEA Placement Levels results: Growth was large, substantial, and statistically significant (see Table III in Appendix).

X Gains in academic performance

How measured:

1. Reading: California Achievement Test (CAT) scores for 3 years (1985-88) reveal that LEP students in the project did well compared with a comparison group of LEP/FEP students at a large school in the district known for high achievement. Students in both groups were similar in socioeconomic status, type of school setting, and LEP coding categories.

   - 1985-86: LEP students performed significantly better than the comparison group (see Table IV in Appendix).
   - 1986-87: LEP students showed substantial and statistically significant reading achievement compared with the cohort group (see Table V in the Appendix).
   - 1987-88: Overall gains were substantial, and the comparison group's gains were considerably lower (see Table VI in the Appendix).

2. Written Expression: CAT scores also were used for the three years. For the first year (1985-86), only scores for the treatment group were used. For the other two years, however, procedures to the reading results were used to obtain a comparison sample. Results were:

   - 1985-86: Scores for LEP students in the program were compared with national norms and found to represent large gains when comparing English-only students with children who started out with low English proficiency (see Table VII in the Appendix).
   - 1986-87: Gains were statistically significantly higher than that for the comparison group of similar district FEP/LEP students (see Table VIII in the Appendix).
   - 1987-88: Gains were statistically significantly higher than that for the comparison group of similar district FEP/LEP students (see Table IX in the Appendix).

	Grade	Year	Year	#	Reading Scale Score	Reading Percentile/ Rank	Math Scaled Score	Math Percentile/ Rank	% LEP	% tile
Edison Elem	3	89-90	89	67	246	26	249	20	70	97
Edison Elem	6	89-90	89	81	249	38	258	37	64	99
Jefferson Ele	3	89-90	89	33	262	39	262	29	69	97
Jefferson Ele	6	89-90	89	66	240	29	272	52	61	99
Mann Elem	3	89-90	89	44	265	41	256	24	82	99
Mann Elem	6	89-90	89	80	235	26	262	41	72	99

24. Attendance:

25. Other:

Narrative Description:

SEA RATIONALE

It was felt that while the in-place transitional bilingual education programs for the Spanish and Armenian speaking LEP students was providing appropriate assistance, other students ,particularly those speaking other than Spanish or Armenian, e.g. students speaking "exotic" languages, needed a program to provide assistance and access to the core curriculum, since these exotic languages were not offered primary language instruction, due to shortage of TBE teachers and materials, etc. Further, it was felt that once LEP students entered the crucial stage of "transition" (e.g. adding English reading and in the case of some Spanish and Armenian speaking LEP students, transitioning from L1 to L2 reading instruction), the vast majority of students "in transition" were neither receiving adequate instruction nor achieving at a significant rate. Traditionally, the 4-6 students at the three project schools have contained large numbers of students in transition. While it was felt that it was less difficult to provide instruction to students in say either primary language instruction, or only basic beginning English language instruction, the problem remained that the students "in-transition" who were moving toward becoming totally functional in English, required more focused attention.

In summary, while it was felt that (prior to SEA) the district had provided LEP students with basic communicative skills--students still needed services to acquire academic language proficiency skills to enable them to achieve success in school, e.g. emphasis on the development of CALP, cognitive academic learning proficiency as opposed to only the development of BICS, basic interpersonal communicative skills. Hence, the present program or Sheltered English Approach allows LEP students to acquire English language proficiency through basic communicative skills academic language skills.

26. Theoretical framework of Exemplary Program:

The Sheltered English Approach (SEA) Program is designed to serve the needs of Limited English Proficient Students , grades 4-6. This program is described as a "Transitional Bilingual Education" program and has achieved academic excellence for LEP students by developing a "Sheltered English Approach" (SAIP) which includes:

a. in-depth training for project staff
b. modified curriculum for classroom use in social studies and science
c. heterogeneous classroom instruction

The working definition for sheltered English is an approach to teaching ESL which uses English as a medium for providing comprehensible content area instruction. The SEA was developed to address the needs of a linguistically, culturally and socially diverse student population.

PEDAGOGICAL FOUNDATION

The underlying theoretical framework for the SEA builds upon the research of Krashen (1985) which states that:

• language is learned when delivered as "comprehensible input" "comprehensible input" must contain language or vocabulary already known to a student

• talk becomes comprehensible to students through context and reference to background knowledge or context embedded and cognitively undemanding experiences.

Sheltered English is referred to as an approach to teaching ESL, and uses English as the medium for providing content area instruction, e.g. social studies, science and health. It provides pertinent content instruction to LEP students while it emphasizes development of their language skills(Savitt, 1985; Krashen 1985; Parker, 1985; Guzman, 1986). These principles guide the sheltered English classroom:

- focus on meaning and not form
- simplified or caretaker speech
- controlled vocabulary
- use of demonstrations, experiments and hands-on materials

Further, this SEA Program supports the notion that positive interaction among students in bilingual programs results in increased self-esteem and academic achievement.

KEY PROGRAM COMPONENTS

- Staff development training in bilingual methodology and sheltered approaches to include (and emphasize) cooperative learning
- emphasis of classroom demonstration lessons and peer coaching and feedback
- teacher developed modified curriculum to accompany social studies, science and health state texts
- a process for curriculum modification
- emphasis on integration of curricular areas
- support and commitment of administrator and staff

PRIMARY LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES

As described earlier in this protocol, a structured primary language development component is available for some of the target students--namely some of the Spanish and Armenian speaking LEP students. In each of the three sites, this type of primary language support begins in the primary grades and extends into grades 4-6 as needed. This daily primary language basic skill instruction includes reading and writing skills, for the purpose of sustaining achievement in basic subject areas until transfer into English is made. As the students' English proficiency improves, LEP students begin to receive content area instruction in English. It is argued that, thus, having acquired language/literacy in the primary language as well as academic background in the L1, instruction in social studies, science and health can now be presented through the Sheltered English Approach in order to develop academic language proficiency.

As explained earlier, this primary language emphasis is provided only for some Spanish and Armenian speaking students, who are not yet ready to enter a Sheltered English environment. Instead, they receive their content and literacy development in the L1. These particular students (as explained earlier) also receive **intensive ESL,** beginning with SURVIVAL ENGLISH and includes progress toward transitional reading.

SECOND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES

The SEA is designed to provide comprehensible second language input in both ESL transitional reading and content area classes, e.g. science, health and social studies. The comprehensible second language input approach includes an emphasis on **communicative** rather than **grammar** based approach. Following are the basic characteristics of a communicative approach, on which the SEA is founded:

- content is based on students' communicative needs
- students are permitted to respond in L1 when necessary
- focus is placed on language function or content rather than grammatical form
- grammatical accuracy is promoted not be correcting errors overtly--but by providing comprehensible input.
- students are encouraged to respond spontaneously and creatively

27. Goals and objectives

- high student achievement and significant gains in English academic achievement including oral language, reading, and written language expression

- positive staff attitudes exemplified on staff survey and significant and positive participation in staff development training

- major objective: Given 1 year of project intervention, target students will show a change from pre to post which is statistically significant compared to norm population or prior performance.

28. Special program features

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Staff development is a integral component of this Sheltered English Approach Title VII project. Staff development was provided through the project teachers and includes themes such as peer coaching and feedback sessions and ongoing classroom demonstrations to increase effective classroom implementation. Cooperative learning has been a major staff development training component. Cooperative learning strategies are a major factor in the effectiveness of the program. Three important outcomes produced through cooperative learning are:

- academic gains for minority and low achieving students
- improved race relations among students in integrated classrooms
- increased prosocial development among all students

Cooperative learning training topics included:

- class building structures
- team building structures
- effective cooperative grouping
- evaluation techniques
- specific strategies
  - mastery
  - concept development
  - cooperative projects
  - task specialization
  - peer coaching techniques
- modified curriculum

MODIFICATION OF CURRICULUM

Teacher curriculum development teams (composed of project teachers) developed curriculum that infused materials and strategies (based on staff development) keyed to district-adopted content area texts in social studies, science and health for grades 4-6. These curriculum notebooks contain key concepts, vocabulary and lessons that are necessary to insure readability and comprehension of grade/level classroom lessons and texts in content areas for LEP and recently transitioned students. This curriculum is available to all project teachers. AND, I SHOULD NOTE, I HAVE HAD MANY OPPORTUNITIES TO OBSERVE THIS CURRICULUM IN USE BY PROJECT TEACHERS WITH THE TARGET STUDENTS.

The curriculum development/modification teams met in grade level groups with content consultants and selected key topics, objectives and lesson design to be used with basic content curriculum.

The curriculum teams utilized a process for curriculum modification.

PROCESS FOR CURRICULUM MODIFICATION

- identification of key concepts
- defining measurable objectives
- development of pertinent vocabulary and objectives
- designing supplementary materials and activities
- lists of audiovisual materials available at district and county office
- effective sheltered strategies include
  - vocabulary strategies
  - comprehension strategies
- methods/lessons to be used for effective lessons

Criteria for selection of materials to be used in the development of the modified curriculum was based on the following:

- state adopted content area curriculum for grades 4, 5 and 6
- current sheltered English methodology
- a method to provide LEP students with curriculum containing concepts and activities commensurate with their English speaking peers
- to include strategies which would make materials interesting and relevant

<u>Sheltered Strategy Materials:</u>

- Criteria for the development of sheltered vocabulary and comprehension strategies has been based on research in the effective teaching of LEP students (Schooling and Language Minority Student)

This research states that:

- vocabulary difficulty significantly affects students comprehension
- teaching and meanings of difficult words increases comprehension of the text
- low ability groups benefit from preteaching
- combining the giving of directions with context information increases comprehension.

Effective Vocabulary Strategies

- categorizing and classifying words
- presenting vocabulary in context
- using simple definitions
- offering pictures and actions to reinforce meaning and stimulate interest

Effective Comprehension Strategies

- analyzing textbook material by pulling key concepts
- oral discussion of lesson
- brainstorming
- mapping and clustering of concepts
- using learning logs and journals
- using manipulatives and hands-on materials to explain concepts

SITE LEADERSHIP

AS STATED IN THE ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE PROPOSAL:(PROJECT CLAIMS)

- There is a commitment and strong desire by principals to participate in the project.
- Each principal has attended workshops on sheltered strategies and has participated in grade-level meetings concerning project implementation
- There is a favorable reaction from each school staff to participation in the project.

NOTE: I WILL CONTINUE TO LOOK FOR VERIFICATION OF THESE CLAIMS RELATED TO SITE LEADERSHIP. .

KEY--THE INTEGRATION OF A MODIFIED CURRICULUM AND VARIOUS COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENTS PLAY A CRUCIAL ROLE IN THIS SHELTERED PROJECT.

KEY PROGRAM COMPONENTS THAT ARE USER PREREQUISITES FOR SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTING THIS SHELTERED ENGLISH APPROACH PROGRAM (Per Academic Excellence Proposal, 1989-1990)

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

- bilingual focus
- primary language program in language arts, math, content area instruction for LEP students who have not met criteria for transition to English
- ESL program conducted by classroom teachers
- transitional reading program
- school-wide reading/language arts program at all of the sites

STAFF

- support of site administrator
- commitment on part of the staff to maintain high quality programs and meet the needs of the student population
- a staff that is open to trying teaching techniques

TRAINING

- conduct needs assessment on staff development needs
- secure and schedule selected authorities for training teachers
- a staff development calendar to include sheltered strategies, cooperative learning and integrated curriculum strategies
- teacher training before implementation of the program

APPENDIX

OVERRIDING GLENDALE SITE THEMES

I believe that the following themes lend to the exemplary nature of the Glendale SHELTERED ENGLISH APPROACH PROGRAM:

•Heterogeneous grouping of students within the SEA e.g. EO/LEP/FEP students are grouped together for content area instruction.

•Strong staff development program is in place.

•SEA program is being replicated at a national level, through as it is a recipient of the "Academic Excellence Award."

•The SEA instructional program (Sheltered English Approach) has had a "filtering down" effect into the other curricular areas of math, language arts and has thus "extended beyond" the content areas of social studies and science.

•This SEA is both "multidimensional" and "multifunctional" in that it serves not only as variety of students, but it also serves different needs of the students, e.g. for some students, it is a "medial" or "bridge" or "transitional" program (these students have had L1 literacy instruction in a TBE classroom) and for others, it is the only specialized program for content instruction utilizing special English language development techniques and strategies and curriculum.

•Strong and on-going evidence of respect and acceptance for all students and their various native languages, cultures.

•Creative and innovative practices designed to meet the needs of all of the students participating in the SAIP, e.g. sheltered instruction, heterogeneous grouping, collaborative and cooperative task accomplishment, schoolwide language arts program and scheduling (non-SAIP specific), utilization of students to serve as L1 interpreters for content/comprehensible input.

•Curriculum is augmented and modified, the process is in place and products are available for teachers to use.

METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocol

Irvine Unified School District, Sheltered English Program at the Secondary Schools

March 1992

School District Context:

1. **Locale:** Southwest

2. **No. students in the district:** __ Over 100,00 __ 50-100,000 __ 25-50,000 X 5-25,000 __ under 5,000

3. **No./level of schools in the district:** ___Pre-K 17 K-6 1 6-8 3 7-8 or 9 4 9 -12

4. **Total No. LEP students in the district:** *Based on Data/Bical Report*

Total LEP Enrollment/1987 - 1044
Total LEP Enrollment/1988 - 1470
Total LEP Enrollment/1989 - 1564
Total LEP Enrollment/1990 - 1607
Total LEP Enrollment 1991 - 1973

5. **Percent of total student population in the district who are LEP:** 8%/*based on Spring 1989 figures, total LEP enrollment was 1564 out of a total school enrollment of 19,931, based on Fall 1988 figures.*

6. **Minority languages represented among students in the district:** as follows for 1989: Korean, Japanese, Spanish, Mandarin, Farsi, Vietnamese, Taiwanese, Cantonese, Hebrew, Filipino, Hindi, Turkish, Cambodian, Portuguese, Other.

7. **Foreign countries represented among students in the district:** see program context, question 13.

8. **SES level of students in the district:** well-educated, middle-class, business and professional. Income in the district exceeds the national average (1980 Census), and the cost of housing is high relative to the national average. Of the adults, 44.7% completed 4 or more years of college, and 28.3% completed from 1 to 3 years of college.
The Japanese students come from professional type family backgrounds. The professionals are here usually for a five year period, to receive training, deliver training at local corporate agencies. Further, 995 of the Japanese students attend Saturday school, which us run by the local Japanese business association. These Saturday schools are staffed by Japanese nationalists, and the Japanese students receive native language maintenance instruction. Japanese families build their social lives around these types of activities. Further, Japanese businessmen send their children to American schools for the sole purpose of learning and becoming literate in English.

   As for Chinese students, they tend to come from entrepreneurial type of family backgrounds. Their families come to America to stay. Family businesses may include pharmaceuticals, clothing, manufacturers and restaurants.

9. **Other pertinent information about the district:** The district is located in a relatively new area which grew as a rural-like suburb of a large, west-coast city. Today, the community has grown into a small city, surrounded by light "think tank" industry and a nearby university. These schools have experienced a dramatic increase (100%) in LEP students over the last several years. Most of the children are from Asian or Middle Eastern families that are well-educated, middle class, business and professional.

Program Context

10. **Grade levels involved in SAIP:** 6 - 12

11. **Total No. LEP students in the SAIP:** 556 (41.5% in 2 middle and 2 high schools);

12. **Minority languages represented in the SAIP:** 13 (Mandarin, Korean, Farsi, Spanish, Taiwanese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Tagalog, Hebrew, Hindi, French, German)

13. **Foreign countries represented among students in the SAIP:** Columbia, Germany, Hong Kong, India, Iran, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan, Vietnam

14. **SES level of students in the SAIP:** Largely Asian or Middle Eastern, well-educated, middle-class, business and professional. (See description for school district above.) *For the most part, Latino students who participate in the SAIP come from working class, lower socioeconomic backgrounds, per teacher interviews. Some of the students are the children of migrant workers who work the fields in Orange County/and/or domestics.*

15. **General description of the exemplary program :**

X only program provided for LEP students in the target schools.
X There is also a bilingual instructional program which is provided as an option for LEP students. NOTE: during an informal interview with project director and the project resource teacher, I learned that historically, (in the early 70's) there had been a Spanish/English TBE program at one of the local elementary schools, designed mainly to serve the needs of children of migrant workers. Once, new developments began to emerge in this locale, many of the fields were purchased for real estate development and hence the TBE bilingual program became very limited. It is no longer a TITLE 7 funded TBE program, however, as I am told, at this particular program, some of the original bilingual teachers remain, and run a very "loosely organized" TBE program for the remaining students, though very limited in number.

X There is also a bilingual instructional program, but it is only for one of the native language groups provided for in the SAIP, nor is it available in the SAIP's target schools.
X The SAIP is a medial program for students exiting from a TBE into mainstream classrooms--this is true in some cases, but not all.
X In addition to the SAIP, instruction in content areas also is provided bilingually and in the native language--In some cases while SAIP instruction is provided using sheltered techniques and cooperative grouping, some of the teachers or instructional aides will use native language during lessons in order to check for understanding or as a comprehension check.

The district has an ESL, language-immersion, magnet program in place for elementary-school children who are at the lowest English-proficiency level. At the site where this program is housed, three hours of English and some sheltered content is offered to students. As soon as feasible, students begin mainstream math, followed by mainstream electives and PE. The goal is to eventually and quickly move the students into their local elementary schools. If transition to the local elementary school has not been achieved by the seventh grade (usually because of late entry into the program),

students can be assigned to one of the two sheltered-English programs at the middle or junior high school.

Sheltered I, the original sheltered program submitted as this district's exemplary SAIP site, operates out of 2 high and 2 middle schools. Sheltered II operates at 1 high school and 2 middle schools. Both sheltered programs are funded by Title VII, separately, but share many resources. The older program dates back four years. The newer program is only two years old.

Another service for LEP students at the elementary level in the district is Project CELL (Computer Education for Language Learning), a program identified for dissemination under Title VII's Academic Excellence Program. The Cell program is designed to increase the gains of first through sixth grade limited English proficient students in English Reading and Language Arts. It focuses on enhancing the abilities of LEP students to accomplish four objective.

1. Acquisition of a sight vocabulary and ability to use root words and context clues to decode unfamiliar words.
2. Comprehension of written passages in English by extracting ideas, and drawing conclusions.
3. Utilization of correct capitalization and punctuation.
4. Recognition and use of standard written English.

NOTE: It is possible that graduates of the CELL program may currently be participating in the SAIP. While this is possible in limited cases (due to the fact that most of the CELL students should "transition" into mainstream classes by the end of the sixth grade) this would have to checked be their to see if the numbers were significant for CELL graduates as current participants in the SAIP.

16. Funding history:

X Currently funded as SAIP by Title VII
_ Supported by state and local funding
_ Supported solely by state and local funding, but previously funded by Title VII
_ Supported by special state funding
_ Supported by other federal funding
_ Collaboratively funded by two or more agencies or sources

There are two programs in operation funded under Title VII. The first is four years old; the second is two years old. Both programs draw from some of the same resources. However, while they are parallel in implementation and training, they are separated geographically. Only the first program is being studied.

Note: That the Irvine School District has just been awarded a new Title VII award, to be funded as a SAIP for the elementary schools and will be modeled after the secondary SAIP program. The total award is for approximately $50,000 over the next 3-5 years. The project director is considering whether or not to compete for an academic excellence award for dissemination. Dr. Meadows, of the Irvine School District, recently wrote and won a Title VII special populations grant to serve the needs of pre-kinder and K/1 students, using a Montessori approach.

17. Other pertinent information about the specialized program:

Program characteristics:

18. How students are served:

X **District-wide program** (Program serves several schools)

_ **School-wide program** (All classes at a school contain LEP students in program)
X **Partial school program** (A portion of the grades participate in the program)
Grades 6-12 participate in this program.
X **Self-contained instruction** (All instruction is provided in the classroom)
X **Ungraded** (Many age levels frequently in the same instructional setting)
_ **Graded** (Students of same age always in same instructional setting)
_ **Pull-out instruction** (LEP students receive some instruction outside the classroom)-In some cases, students are grouped according to language proficiency level and are assigned to a rotation type activity, which may involve a small group reporting to either the teacher (for guided classroom instruction either in social studies or in language arts for example), special storytelling teacher (who is located in the library, and students receive instruction in literature), or in the computer lab with a specially trained lab teacher.
Students have an opportunity to rotate to each of the three "centers". The SAIP classroom teacher coordinates this effort with the other two individuals.

To the extent that it is possible, LEP students in the program are assigned to all-LEP classrooms. It is the philosophy of the district that the sheltered-English approach works best in such classes, since it does not hold back fluent English students who can move at a more rapid pace. The availability of teachers trained in sheltered instruction and certified in a specialty, as well as programming constraints, limit the options available to LEP students. As a result, students will sometimes have to take mainstream content-area classes.

Program variation can be seen by assignment of students to classes for the years 1985-88:

19. How English language development (ELD) is provided:

X **ESL instruction** (Formal ESL instruction is provided as a separate instructional period)
X **Sheltered English** (English proficiency is developed using English as the medium for providing comprehensible content area instruction)
X **Integrated English instruction** (English development is integrated into content instruction)
X **English immersion** (Teachers are fluent in students' native language(s), but instruct only in English)--In most cases, teachers use only English. However, in one case, I observed one of the five focal teachers using Spanish in order to check for comprehension. Further, I observed Chinese and Japanese students assisting one another with classroom presentations, translating, etc.
_ **Computer support** (English is taught using computer assisted instruction)
_ **Individualized instruction** (IEPs are developed for individual students and formulate the basis for developing English proficiency)
X **Special textbooks/instructional materials** are provided

Both ESL instruction and a sheltered-English environment for content-area instruction are provided. Sheltered English is described as involving "a series of instructional strategies used in combination with a modified curriculum and materials in order to provide meaningful content-area instruction." While sheltered-English instruction is most effective for intermediate English-learning students who have reached a level of proficiency that makes them receptive to this sort of instruction, it is also used in the high school with new arrivals.

At the four schools served by the Sheltered I program, a total of 5 ESL classes have been instituted, as well as 4 language/literature classes, 5 social studies classes, and 1 science class. At the Sheltered II program, there are 4 ESL classes, 5 social studies, 1 science, and 1 math class.

20. Instructional strategies utilized:

_ Team teaching (Two or more teachers are responsible for instruction in the same classroom)

X Peer teaching (Older students). At several of the school sites. In one instance, I observed an English speaking (EO) students may work in an English and Social Studies Class, serving as a "ESL assistant" with a group of 3-4 Spanish speaking students.
X Cooperative learning (Instructional activities require that students collaborate to produce a common product)
_ Individualized instruction (IEPs and other strategies are used to individualize instruction for students)
X Language experience approach (Reading, writing, speaking, listening are taught interactively building on students' experiences as basis for language learning experiences)
X Small group instruction (Students are grouped for instruction along varying criteria which are instructionally related) Students are grouped ungraded, depending on language proficiency levels as well as (in some cases) for instructional needs. Grouping is definitely heterogeneous.
X Laboratory instruction (Students are provided a variety of environments in a single laboratory for learning skills and content)--This is part of a school wide program--opportunity available to all students at one of the focal schools.
X Community resources (Resources from outside the school, including volunteers, are tapped to provide instructional support)
X Tutorial sessions (Instructional aides or other adults work individually with students
X Special textbooks/instructional materials are provided

Sheltered English is the approach used in the program, based upon work of Cummins and Krashen.

The five major hypotheses of Dr. Stephen Krashen are cited:

- the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis
- the Natural Order Hypothesis
- the Monitor Hypothesis
- the Input Hypothesis
- the Affective Filter Hypothesis

Also cited is Cummins' Second Language Acquisition Theory. The program literature contains the following goals for LEP students based upon Cummins' model:

- attainment of academic success,
- development of self-esteem,
- procurement of English language proficiency.

Two elements of language proficiency are cited: Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills and Cognitive Academic Linguistic Proficiency. Also cited is Common Underlying Proficiency.

The natural approach stages included are: preproduction, early production, speech emergence, and intermediate fluency.

The components of Sheltered English that are utilized are: simplified input, use of contextual clues, check for understanding, appropriate lessons, and clustering of students.

Note: I have received a copy of the Irvine Unified School Districts training manual that is used for the SAIP teachers, "The Sheltered Solution," which was developed by 2 of the SAIP resource teachers. It contains detailed lesson plans for sheltered instruction as well as an overview of language acquisition and cross-cultural communication, cooperative grouping, vocabulary development, reading and writing, listening and speaking, as well as a demographic overview. I have had the opportunity to review this training manual and am impressed by its' comprehensive approach. During my visits to the SAIP classrooms, I have had the opportunity to observe teachers using this guide.

21. Instructional Personnel

- X Teachers are trained in language development techniques
- X Some teachers hold state certification for teaching LEP students
- X Staff development is provided SAIP staff in latest research and methodologies
- X Staff development is regularly provided for mainstream teachers in language development strategies
- X Teachers are provided planning time during the school day-This is true in several cases and I am asking for more specific information on this.
- X Instructional aides (Bilingual IAs assist teachers in the classroom, to a limited degree)

To provide the SAIP, a cadre of secondary content-area teachers had to be trained. This is considered the most important component of the SAIP. Training consisted of six topics formally presented with supporting reference material to be read and disseminated in notebook format. Topics were:

I. Second Language Acquisition
   a. Natural Approach stages
   b. Cummin's Model of Language Proficiency
   c. Krashen's 5 SLA Hypotheses
   d. Facts or Myths about LEP Students
   e. Components of Sheltered English

II. Listening and Speaking Skills
III. Reading and Writing Skills
IV. Cooperative Learning
V. Cross-cultural Perspective and Awareness
VI. Lesson Planning and Implementation

Since the project began four years ago, a total of approximately 100 teachers and administrative personnel have been trained, covering the topics listed above. The trained personnel represent seven different junior and senior high schools in the district, all served by one of the two sheltered English Projects. The same training takes place every spring one day a week over three weeks. In the fall, the teachers get two more full-day inservice training sessions. Support materials that have been purchased for the Project are distributed in the fall and collected in the spring. During the semester, teachers are encouraged to visit colleagues who have been using sheltered instruction for a longer time.

The budget of the two sheltered-English projects is used to hire substitute teachers during the time teachers are away from their classes for training or for visitation. The two resource teachers serving the sheltered projects plan and conduct the training together for the staff at their assigned schools. Training in the spring is to prepare teachers for the fall semester. Given the cadre of teachers that is already in place at each site, the training is set up to reach other content-area teachers, especially in content areas where the project would like to set up additional sheltered-English classes.

22. Community involvement

- X Parent advisory committee
- X Parents as volunteers
- _ Evening ESL classes offered to parents
- _ Home visits made by bilingual community liaisons
- X Meetings for parents to learn about program

Parents have been provided information routinely at regularly-scheduled meetings. They also were invited to participate in inservice meetings held for regular staff. A letter of introduction to the program has been prepared in 7 different languages. Four community liaison/language specialists are employed part-time. They are the equivalent of instructional aides but represent four of the language groups served by the program and are fully bilingual in English and their native language. They speak Taiwanese/ Mandarin, Korean, Japanese, and Iranian. All have at least a BA from their home countries, and some also taught there.

Student performance:

23. Evidence of exceptional LEP student performance in:

X **Relative gains in English proficiency**
How measured: Idea Proficiency Test (IPT)

English-speaking performance of LEP students was in the "average" range. Students moved through and out of the ESL program as follows: after two years in the program, the percentages of students originally in grades seven through eleven who were still in ESL were 56%, 50%, 51%, 43%, and 30%, respectively.

X **Gains in academic performance**
How measured: Stanford Reading Test (vocabulary and reading comprehension subtests); Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS, reading, language and mathematics subtests); oral and written English assessments; grade averages; writing samples; and rates of assignment to the Gifted and Talented Education program (GATE), advanced placement, and special education services.

LEP students showed progress on both Stanford tests (reading comprehension and vocabulary) and the CTBS reading test, and "out of this world" performance on the CTBS mathematics test, for which most of the median percentile ranks were above 90. LEP students performed at a B level on the average, but most median GPAs declined slightly. This was interpreted as a possible reflection of a tendency to take more demanding academic courses as English proficiency grew. Rates of assignment to GATE, to advanced placement classes and to special education services increased dramatically.

1987-88 mean scale scores on the CTBS reading test were higher than 1986-87 mean scale scores. Differences for five grade levels were reported. Four of these differences were "large" and one was "small."

Increases in percentile ranks on the CTBS reading test were reported for four of five grade levels as well.

Records were kept on the placement of target students into the Gifted and Talented Program, advanced placement classes, and special education services only for years two and three of the project. In year two, two students were placed in GATE, whereas in year three, fifteen target students were placed, an increase of 750%. Parallel numbers for advanced placement are 18 and 54, an increase of 300%. Six students received special education services in year two, and twenty-two received services in year three.

A one-year pretest-posttest analysis of writing sample ratings revealed mixed results--two grade levels showed positive growth; two remained the same, and one declined slightly.

X **Time required before students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms**
How measured: date of reclassification

In the first year of the project, 1.2% of the students were reclassified. In the second year, 31.3% were reclassified. In year three, 66.3% were reclassified.

__ **Extent to which promotion or graduation requirements are met**
How measured:

24. Attendance:
LEP students' attendance increased due to the fact that many of them enrolled in school late in the first year that measures were taken.

25. Other: The project evaluator, Dr. Richard Piper, has provided me with the last three years of evaluation reports. Upon analysis of these reports, I will enter pertinent. For the most part, data for the first year of the project are not available, as the project evaluator at the time, did not provide this type of data. According to Dr. Piper, "The current data may not show the impact of the program as clearly as we would like." He did indicate that the students are moving toward English proficiency at an "acceptable" rate. It was also indicated that there is a linear relationship between students' ESL level and performance on the CTBS test. Further, the IPT placement for kids on ESL level is accurate and correlates with the CTBS level.

Narrative Description:

26. Theoretical framework of Exemplary Program

The Irvine Unified School district program functions under the theoretical orientation as featured in the research of Cummins (1979) and his notion of "conversational English" and "academic English" or Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Cummins asserts that "conversational English" is context embedded and is derived from interpersonal involvement in a shared reality or "context." It is commonly referred to as "conversational English." He further asserts that "academic English" is context-reduced language, and that it is a "one-of-a-kind language skills that is required for literacy, such as decoding, reading, comprehension, deriving meaning from context, study skills, writing mechanics, writing proficiency, vocabulary development, to name a few. Based upon this theoretical orientation, the Irvine Unified School District has identified the following key components for its "Sheltered English Program":

•Context-embedded language. The instructional strategies to be used in the SAIP will include a context-embedded approach, where instruction will take care to provide on-going comprehensible input of content. Project-developed support materials to supplement instruction in regular secondary classrooms will embody this concept. Ongoing, concrete, meaningful clues and supportive help to support the context-reduced language of the regular content classroom for the LEP learner will be provided.

•Academic English is necessary for school success. Within this component, the Irvine School District states that it is "deeply concerned about the LEP secondary student who is assessed as ready to handle a full academic program in English on the basis of his/her facility with 'conversational English'" (SAIP Grant Proposal, Page 4). While the secondary LEP student may often exhibit "command" of conversational English, it is further stated that the goal of the program is to "develop within all LEP learners a structured command of 'academic English.'"

•English as a Second Language. The research in this area shows that the student learns a second language in much the same way s/he acquires a first language. The SAIP incorporates a natural language approach and stresses an evolutionary acquisition of language, where the focus is on communication before form. The following tenets support this approach:

1. Listening comprehension (in context) as a prerequisite to oral production

2. Oral production that is meaningful
3. Correction by expansion
4. Focus on communication before form
5. Strong vocabulary development that is based on the students environment and is supported with pictures and ralia
6. Personalized instruction
7. The student must receive comprehensible input/and speech must contain a message and the student must feel a "need" to "communicate" the message
8. Comprehensible Input must be supplied in a low-anxiety environment.

•The Affective Filter. The Irvine SAIP further promotes a belief in maintaining the students "affective filter" based on Krashens research. According to the project proposal, "personality, motivation, self-esteem, feelings toward the primary language, feelings toward the secondary language and the secondary culture--relate to success in second language acquisition." Key to this notion is that the SAIP takes into consideration the students feelings about themselves, their native culture and primary language and state they are "strongly correlated to academic success" (Page 6).

Finally, an overriding theme for the Irvine Unified School Districts SAIP states that:

"The potential of 'sheltered' English provides us with a way of more effectively fulfilling our educational responsibilities. And, hopefully, it will help us all to stop referring to language minority pupils as 'those LEP students' who belong to 'those bilingual teachers' and help more of us to start referring instead to 'our students' who belong to 'all of us.'"

27. Goals and objectives:

1. To improve the reading, math, and English language skills of LEP students.
2. To improve the skills of staff in teaching LEP students in grades 7-12.
3. To acquire and develop appropriate curriculum to assist LEP students in learning English and in support of mastering basic secondary skills.
4. To provide parent education to parents of LEP secondary students.

Based on the original SAIP grant proposal, the following objectives are defined:

•To facilitate English fluency in all areas - listening, speaking, reading and writing.
•To provide supplemental bilingual support in content areas in the participating LEP student's native language as necessary for students to progress academically while acquiring English fluency.
•To enhance cross-cultural understanding and bicultural skills of both LEP and non-LEP students.
•To improve home/school communication and to assist parents in acquiring skills necessary to reinforce their children's learning experiences.
•To provide staff training activities which will increase staff capacities to effectively support LEP students in achieving academic competence in all secondary subject areas.
•To acquire, develop, and disseminate materials which will increase the capacity of the district to carry out the services after funding.
•To direct goals toward increasing LEP students self-concept and eagerness; developing positive attitudes toward his/her primary language and culture and towards English and the dominant culture; enabling the students to participate fully in all school activities.
•To enable the district to assume fiscal responsibility for the bilingual program by seeking out, utilizing and evaluating local and state resources and by providing the efficiency of the local delivery system.

28. Special program features

1. A Sheltered English program for LEP students.

2. Assistance to LEP students as they participate in the regular school program.
3. Procurement of developed curriculum materials, including essential vocabulary for each curricular area, development of affective education materials, and development of workbooks in subject areas.
4. Parent education including: parent introduction to the school, parent handbooks in the parents' native language, English as a Second Language instruction, and multicultural activities.
5. Staff development activities include: using the Sheltered English approach, skills in modifying curriculum to meet the needs of LEP students, skills in diagnosing and prescribing instructional strategies, and how to communicate effectively with parents.
6. Multicultural activities to enhance self-esteem and cross-cultural understanding will be conducted as an integral part of the social studies, ESL, and literature classes.
7. Primary language aides
8. Peer and cross-age tutoring
9. Using Literature, Music and Art to explore cultural diversity and express feelings.
10. Music, Drama and Dance productions to promote multicultural sharing and understanding.
11. Video-tape productions
12. Field trips
13. Preparing and sharing foods of different cultures.

Note: New entries based on proposal and for the most part, supported in my observations.

METRO Center Site Descriptive Protocol

Linda Vista Elementary School, San Diego City Schools

San Diego, California

March 1992

School District Context:

1. **Locale:** Southwest

2. **No. students in the district:** X Over 100,00 __ 50-100,000 __ 25-50,000 __ 5-25,000 __ under 5,000

3. **No./level of schools in the district:** 112 Elem (including K) 19 middle/JHS 20 HS 1 K-12 4 4-12

   A desegregation lawsuit in the 1970s ordered the district to reorganize to achieve racial balance. This led to a number of organizational variations, including magnet schools. Thus of the 112 elementary schools, only 80 are traditional K-12 configurations. Others vary from K-2, K-3, K-4, K-5 to 3-6.

4. **Total No. LEP students in the district:** 25,035- (BASED ON DATA/BICAL REPORT)

TOTAL DISTRICT ENROLLMENT 1991: 111,198 (K-12)

Total LEP Enrollment/1987 - 16,069
Total LEP Enrollment/1988 - 17,265
Total LEP Enrollment/1989 - 19,402
Total LEP Enrollment 1990 - 22,321
Total LEP Enrollment 1991 - 25,035

5. **Percent of total student population in the district who are LEP:** *20.7%*

6. **Minority languages represented among students in the district:**

   Spanish, Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Chinese, Farsi, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, Arabic, Portuguese, other.

County LEP Student Distribution - (BASED ON 1991 DATA BICAL REPORT

Spanish	50,170
Vietnamese	3027
Cantonese	341
Korean	342
Philippine/Tagalog	2238
Portuguese	63
Mandarin	121
Japanese	465
Cambodian	1209
Lao	1732
All Others	3381
Total County LEP Count	63,088

7. **Foreign countries represented among students in the district:** reflected in the language groups above

8. **SES level of students in the district:** Reflects the variety found in large urban settings.

    - Across the district, the socioeconomic index for all grade 3 students is 2.05 (3 is highest SES, 1 is lowest), and for all grade 6 students, 1.99.
    - Aid for dependent children is provided to 21.4% of students' families at grade 3, and to 20.5% at grade 6.
    - According to a 10/16 interview with the school Principal, 97% of total school enrollment are on free lunch.

9. **Other pertinent information about the district:** The district is a large, urban district 25 miles from the Mexican border. Consequently, it has experienced years of integrating the children of aliens, sometimes in the U.S. illegally, into its school system. The district has been nationally recognized for its bilingual education programs and for the leadership it and surrounding districts have provided to the rest of the nation in these programs for Spanish-speaking LEP students. A recent event which attracted large numbers of other language groups to the district was the location of one of the first major Southeast Asian relocation centers at the nearby Mirimar Marine training base. This accounts for the large numbers of Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Hmong children in the district.

The desegregation plan devised by the district has created a number of Magnet Schools as well as a variety of organizational variations. As a result, school district personnel are used in the process of restructuring instructional programs to meet the changing needs of its diversifying student population.

Linda Vista Elementary school is part of the **"Restructuring San Diego City Schools"** initiative which began in May 1986 when the San Diego superintendent appointed a group of 17 community leaders to study the impact of changing technology, demographic and economic shifts and cultural plurality with regard to the needs of the S.D.school children in the 21st century. This restructuring movement emerged as a result of several nationally disseminated educational reform reports, e.g. Horace's Compromise, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century between 1983-1986. The findings of the San Diego School Districts 17 community leaders evolved into the **Schools of the Future Commission.** This Commission published its' report ("Which Way to the Future? San Diego and its Schools at a Crossroads" in June 1987). In this report, the Commission described profound discrepancies between what schools provide children today and what they must provide them in the years to come. The Commission argued that children, must be able to reeducate themselves throughout life. As part of the Schools of the Future Commissions primary recommendation--restructuring of schools emerged.

The San Diego City Schools describe restructuring as "a process of empowering teachers and schools to make decisions about classroom/school organization, curriculum, budget, staffing, and accountability so that student performance will improve. It means decentralized decision making rather than centralized bureaucracy. It means the school becomes the center for school management and teachers join with administrators to manage schools. (Restructuring San Diego City Schools: A Brief History)

In June 1987, the Board of Education formalized its' commitment and the resources of the district toward the achievement of innovation and change through a pilot called the "Schools of the Future Initiative." To guide the district in this endeavor, the superintendent appointed a leadership group, **The Innovation and Change Leadership Group (ICLG)** that

includes "equal representation by teachers and administrators, and contains parent and community representatives. This groups' charge was the development of a plan for the implementation of the Schools of the Future Initiative and for the coordination of restructuring efforts across the district.

The core beliefs set out the by ICLG define the purpose and guidelines of restructuring that include:

- a commitment to a long-term strategic planning process
- is rooted in the findings and recommendations of the Schools of the Future Commission
- can be accomplished with existing district resources and within district policies and contracts
- requires an environment of trust, flexibility, and risk-taking
- requires a balance between greater autonomy and more responsibility for schools
- can be successful in San Diego and result in a valuable model for other school districts

There are teams from fifteen elementary, six middle/junior high, and four senior high schools who met at the end of June 1988, to participate in a "Super Planning Week"-- a four day strategic planning workshop to develop the skills needed to lead school staffs through the planning process. Using case-study and role playing in groups, each team participated in a model planning and team building exercise which included how to develop and plan a vision/goal statement, how to generate options for achieving that vision, how to develop an implementation plan, and how to design ongoing evaluation and assessment procedures.

The school restructuring initiative was formally recognized by the Board in its policy statement on school restructuring, approved November 8, 1988. This particular school board meeting was held at a restructuring school, **Linda Vista Elementary,** and featured comments from various restructuring schools and from members of the ICLG.

As of February 1989, over 30 schools "have expressed their commitment to the restructuring process and are engaged in various stages of the planning and implementation process. Over the past two years, the Schools of the Future program has gained support and momentum in San Diego under the policy direction of the Board of Education. Most importantly, professionals throughout the district are working together with community members to discover new ways to create schools where all students can and will succeed." (Restructuring San Diego City Schools: A Brief History)

Program Context

10. **Grade levels involved in Exemplary Program:** Pre-K through 6, 970 students located at 2 campuses: Pre-K and K + special education students at one site, and grades 1-6 at the other.

    *Note: The Pre-K program is located away from the 1-6 SAIP, at the Annex. Also during an interview with the school principal I learned that this campus is designated as a Minority Isolated School--which is involved in a voluntary integration plan as a "sender school."

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION FOR 1988-1989: (Based on School Profile, September '89)

Hispanic	White	Afr.Am.	Asian	Pac.Isl.	Fil.	Indo.	Nat.Am
17.8	12.6	6.3	0.8	0.8	2.8	59.0	0.0

11. **Total No. LEP students in the program:** 526, or over 50% of total student body, 62% of whom are Southeast Asian refugees. The second largest group are the Hispanics from Mexico and Central America.

12. **Minority languages represented in the SAIP:** Hmong, Vietnamese, Laotian, Cambodian, Spanish, Filipino/

13. **Foreign countries represented among students in the school:** Laos, Vietnam, Mexico., Philippines

14. **SES level of students in the school:** Very low SES.

Grade	SEI*	%AFDC**
3 for total district	2.05	21.4
3 for ex.prog.	1.39	42.6
6 for total district	1.99	20.5
6 for ex. prog.	1.49	42.6

***Socioeconomic index:** 3 is highest, 1 is lowest based on state assessment program
****Aid for dependent children**

Thus, at both grades 3 and 6 (for which assessment data are provided by the state), the students in the exemplary program are far below district averages both in terms of the socioeconomic index and aid for dependent children.

Families tend to live together, in an "extended" setting, e.g. father, mother, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, grandparents, who all assist in the child care. Some children are here with their extended families and without their parents. Also, there are many siblings across the ethnic groups, e.g. in a "typical" Hmong family, there may be 8-10 children. The older Hmong girls care for the younger siblings. There are also teenage marriages amongst the Homg. Hmong girls usually tend to marry older men, usually "within" the culture.

15. **General description of the exemplary program:**

_ only program provided for LEP students

X There is also a bilingual instructional program which is provided as an option for LEP students (Available for Spanish LEPs and Vietnamese LEPs-primary grades)

X Although the district reports that there is also a bilingual instructional program, but not for the native language groups provided for in the program--this is not necessarily the case. Both Spanish and Vietnamese speaking LEPs participate in the SAIP to a greater degree, since the bilingual program is offered only in the primary grades. Specifically, a Spanish TBE program is offered in grades K-3 where literacy development in the L1 is emphasized and classrooms are staffed with bilingual teachers. The Vietnamese TBE is offered to first graders. This program is staffed with one Vietnamese speaking teacher and one English speaking teacher. Also, not all Spanish or Vietnamese speaking LEP students will necessarily participate in a TBE program, due to a variety of factors, including, over representation of students (high numbers within these 2 language groups), parent preference, etc. Hence, it is highly possible to have LEP Spanish and Vietnamese speakers as participants in the SAIP, with no involvement in the TBE

program. Students from both of the TBE's are heterogeneously "mainstreamed" in the p.m. program, with the rest of the student body.

X The ELD/exemplary program is a medial program for students exiting from a TBE into mainstream classrooms-- especially for SAIP students who have reached the transitional stage, as they prepare to enter "mainstream English" or "non-sheltered" classroom environments.

X In addition to the ELD/Exemplary Program, instruction in some content areas is also provided bilingually and in the native language--Except for a Spanish and Vietnamese self-contained bilingual program, all LEP students receive the district's Social Studies curriculum through their primary language. They are "regrouped"--NOT PULLED OUT, for primary language instruction during one period of instruction in the morning. Instruction during L1 social studies may be carried out by a teacher who speaks the L1 and/or a "team" consisting of a teacher and instructional aide with L1 literacy. I observed both.

The ELD/Exemplary Program resulted from a School Improvement Plan developed by the staff with their new principal in 1988. This was developed to reflect the staff's concerns that equitable instruction was not being offered to the variety of language groups represented among the students. A bilingual education program for Spanish and Vietnamese students has been in operation at the school for awhile. The SAIP offers sheltered English instructional environments for other language groups.

The Process

During a series of interviews with the school Principal, I learned that the process of self analysis and change began during the spring semester of 1988. During the first meeting, the staff was presented with student achievement data, degree of classroom interruptions, pullout instruction, etc. Teachers were asked to look at some needs statements, break into groups and brainstorm a plan to meet those criteria. The staff generated the following needs/criteria :

- more appropriate instructional/language proficiency groupings for each student
- less pullout instruction during morning hours
- more integrated learning experiences
- greater equity of services to all students
- less labeling of special needs students
- a more unified staff
- better use of space

The committees met on an ongoing basis from January to June, and formulated a total school plan for implementation in September, 1988. The total staff participated in the generation and development of the school plan for restructuring.

The Plan

The school principal outlined several "umbrella provisions" which were stipulated by the staff in the initial meetings. This "umbrella" provides a systemic process by which every child is positively affected (and is a recipient of the program) for the major part of the school day. **Hence, supplementary instruction is not a key factor or player in supporting and enhancing underachieving or special needs students.** The overall stipulation include:

- an ungraded curriculum for the entire school

- the development of an early childhood education program for all pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and special education SH students housed at the annex site (two Early Admission to Kindergarten (EAK) classes will be added.
- class size to be reduced for all classrooms
- weekly preparation time to be provided for each teacher
- a reallocation of resources in order to implement the program

Hence, students are grouped in ungraded classrooms within approximately four multi-age groupings--kindergarten, primary, middle and upper. Students are **homogeneously** assigned by **language proficiency** during the morning basic skills time.

Language proficiency levels include Entry level, sheltered A and B, transition A and B and non-sheltered classes, each with entry and exit criteria. An important aspect of the program is its' "fluidity"--according to school personnel (during informal conversations), I learned that expectations are high and students are expected to move from level to level as soon as they have met the criteria--and this does not necessarily occur at the end of the year, as is the case with many LEP programs.

Student progress is monitored by a **LEP REVIEW TEAM**--similar to a consultation or child study team. This LEP Review Team has been incorporated into the program. They serve as a referral/assessment team for individual student referrals, and biannual reviews are conducted to place or move students through the levels.

Mainstreaming and Integration

In order to meet the criteria for providing students with an integrated learning time, students are heterogeneously mixed in the afternoon instructional block. Students are grouped by cultural, language and gender. A departmentalized program is provided where students rotate for 3-week blocks of time, for two subjects per block. Teachers select the subject of their choice and teach only that subject. For example, a student receives science and music or literature and art (integrated) unit of instruction for three weeks and then rotates to another instructional theme/unit. Key to this set-up is the idea that teachers teach a subject of their choice, hence, de-emphasizing the traditional practice of trying to "fit" science, social studies, P.E. into the afternoon schedule. During this p.m. instructional period. students receive intensive content area instruction for the required minutes as well.

Reallocation of Resources

Several part time a.m. teaching positions were allocated to reduce class size as well as provide special programs which may not have been possible within the staffing formula of the school. (These programs include a primary Spanish bilingual program as well as an additional primary sheltered A class). Two other programs were implemented utilizing part time positions. A non-traditional design was implemented for the special education students. The resource specialist is teamed with a part time teacher in the morning. They also receive assistance from two instructional aides and also an hour and a half of additional teacher time--hence providing five adults for approximately 38-40 students. Students are mixed wit the rest of the student population in the p.m. for the departmentalized subjects. It is thought that this schedule allows for an intensive morning program of basic skills without interruption, while it also allows these same students the opportunity to be mainstreamed and integrated into the p.m. program.

An important component of the program is a Parent Outreach/Education effort. A cadre of community aides reaches out to parents through monthly home visits as well as on-going

parent education workshops. While traditional approaches (like organized parent groups and volunteer activities) are conducted, the school generally goes to the parent/community.

Parent education workshops evolved from a needs assessment conducted by the parents. Workshops are delivered by community/staff members in the appropriate language.

16. Funding history: *

_ Currently funded as SAIP by Title VII--*
_ have never received Title VII funds
X Supported by state and local funding
_ Supported solely by state and local funding, but previously funded by Title VII
X Supported by special state funding
X Supported by other federal funding
X Collaboratively funded by two or more agencies or sources, e.g. School Improvement and Chapter 1.
X Supported by outside moneys (e.g., foundations)

The basic program is funded with local and state funds. The school also participates in:

- the state's School Improvement Program (SIP) in which moneys are allocated to ensure that each student meets district goals and state competencies;
- Chapter I, which provides funds for additional counseling and guidance and a full-time nurse;
- Chapter II, which provides supplementary instruction for students experiencing difficulty in reading, math, and language development.
- Wells Fargo funding for the community and parent outreach program.

Note: various foundations are supporting the school districts restructuring efforts. For example.

Linda Vista received one of 15 Next Century Schools grants. This was a national competition funded by the RJR Nabisco Foundation. L.V. has received state and national attention, assisting other schools/staffs in beginning the process of restructuring.

The RJR Nabisco grant has allowed L.V. to dramatically enhance the assessment process. Portfolios are being maintained by teachers school-wide, with an emphasis on language arts. The grant has contributed to maintenance of portfolios electronically. The teacher computer stations and training are in process at the annex. This training will take place at the main campus during the 1991-1992 school year.

The Next Century Schools project has been used to fund four part-time teachers, thus contributing to a substantial reduction in class size (school-wide). It has also allowed L.V. to implement a teacher intern program for primary language instruction. Hmong, Vietnamese and Spanish speaking interns have been employed, working directly with the instructional aides, to strengthen the primary language arts program.

A systematic staff development effort is in place, through the grant. Staff development has focused on alternative assessment, cooperative learning and the Socratic Seminar. This money has also been used to provide pre and post service (June 90 - August 90) in order to refine the program, establish school standards for language arts and prepare for electronic portfolio assessment.

Moreover, a comprehensive evaluation design is in place for the grant. It includes standardized test data, portfolio assessment results, and parent and staff survey results.

(Information based on April 26, 1991 Update on Restructuring Process).

17. **Other pertinent information about the Program:** When the current principal was appointed in 1987, it was apparent that the needs of the school were immense. Services to students were perceived by the staff to be inequitable; communication and morale were poor; and continuity of instruction was sporadic. Coupled with the San Diego School districts restructuring movement and efforts and the leadership of the school principal moving and organizing the staff in a self-study process, the first steps of participation in the SIP process of self-analysis and change, began in the spring semester of 1988. The program which resulted is a schoolwide program which is designed to serve all students, regardless of ethnicity, language proficiency or gender. All students benefit from their involvement in this program.

An underlying principle of this exemplary program that extends to the entire school program is that the school staff does not rely on remedial instruction in addressing the needs of this diverse student population. While much of the instruction for LEP students may be delivered in a sheltered environment, all students receive social studies daily, in their primary language. Students receive this primary language instruction through the use of Silver Burdett Social Studies series as well as special units which were developed either at the district or school site level.

Program characteristics:

18. **How students are served:**

X **District-wide program** (Program serves several schools)*This SAIP is part of a schoolwide restructuring initiative, which to date, involves up to 30 schools from the elementary, middle/junior high and senior high school levels).
X **School-wide program** (All classes at a school contain LEP students in program)
_ **Partial school program** (A portion of the grades participate in the program)
_ **Self-contained instruction** (All instruction is provided in the classroom)
X **Ungraded** (Many age levels frequently in the same instructional setting)
_ **Graded** (Students of same age always in same instructional setting)
_ **Pull-out instruction** (LEP students receive some instruction outside the classroom)
X **Other** Note: All students interact in some way, with this program. For example, even those students in the TBE bilingual Spanish or Vietnamese classes are integrated into the p.m. content area units of instruction.) Note: Students are all regrouped at different periods of the day. In the a.m., students are located in a "homeroom" setting, based on grade assignment (e.g., primary, middle and upper grade) as well as level of English language fluency. During this period, students receive ESL/ELD instruction, Math instruction and some form of language experience, and English Literacy skills development. Then, during the next period of the day, students are grouped into native language and grade appropriate instructional groups in order to receive native language Social Studies instruction. Finally, students are regrouped heterogeneously (in the afternoon) for two periods of content area instruction (including Art, P.E., Gardening, Science, Health, Handwriting, Literature to name a few). During this content instruction time, teachers team up to provide instruction, that lasts for approximately 2 weeks at a time. Children are heterogeneously grouped during this instructional period by Language dominance, level of English language proficiency, gender, ethnicity and grade assignment.

The diverse linguistic and academic needs of the students informed the design of the instructional plan which emerged from the school staff's restructuring activity.

In the morning, all students are grouped homogeneously by language proficiency into one of three groups: Sheltered English, Transition, and Non-sheltered English.

- Sheltered English classes are divided into three levels: Sheltered Entry classes are for students who are in the early stages of English acquisition (grades 1-6). Sheltered A and Sheltered B classes are organized by grade level: early (1-2), middle (3-4), and higher (5-6) grades.

- Transition classes are at two levels for students who are functioning more proficiently in English, but still need some support. These classes are paced more slowly than the next level, which consists of the non-sheltered English classes.

- Non-sheltered English classes are for students ready to handle the regular instructional environment and for native English speakers. Students are assigned by reading level with no more than three grade levels in each class.

Morning instruction is scheduled up to lunch, and covers reading, ELEPS (the district's English as a second language curriculum), writing, spelling, math, and social studies. For social studies, students are regrouped by primary language, and instruction is presented in the native language. To accommodate this, all social-studies instruction occurs at the same time. All LEP students participate in this except for those involved in a Spanish and Vietnamese self-contained bilingual education program at the school, where native language arts is provided.

In the afternoon all students in the school are heterogeneously grouped to obtain a cross section of cultural, linguistic, and gender groups. Instruction focuses on science, art, music, PE, and literature. This instruction is given in 3-week rotations, 2 subjects per 3 weeks. Teachers teach only one subject with the assistance of a team teacher. Additional subjects include rotation in computer lab, counseling center, and math, reading, or oral language labs.

A central feature of the instructional plan is that class size is reduced in order to achieve more individualized instruction and smaller groups. Reorganization included adding 4 teachers to the staff to accommodate smaller class size and special programs added to the curriculum.

19. How English language development (ELD) is provided:

X **ESL instruction** (Formal ESL instruction is provided as a separate instructional period)
X **Sheltered English** (English proficiency is developed using English as the medium for providing comprehensible content area instruction)
X **Integrated English instruction** (English development is integrated into content instruction)
_ **English immersion** (Teachers are fluent in students' native language(s), but instruct only in English)
X **Computer support** (Some English is taught using computer assisted instruction)
_ **Individualized instruction** (IEPs are developed for individual students and formulate the basis for developing English proficiency)
X **Special textbooks/instructional materials** are provided (for example, AGP Holt Math program, Houghton Mifflin Series Reading Program, ELEPS)
X **Literature Based Program**

LEP students are assigned to levels of English proficiency, and English development is provided relevant to each proficiency level. Expectations are high; students are expected to move from level to level as quickly as possible. Homogeneous grouping of students by proficiency level for each morning when they receive language-development instruction allows students to move to higher levels without waiting until the end of a grading period to make a formal change.

Three general proficiency levels are used, with gradations within each:

- Entry Level: very little English. Students are separated into 2 groups: Pre-K or K students in one and grades 1-6 in the other.
- Sheltered: shows maturity in following directions and listening skills. Designations are Primary, Middle, and Upper elementary grades.
- Transition A and Transition B: ready to begin process of mainstreaming into regular instructional environments.

English language development is provided through ELEPS. This is a prescriptive program developed by teachers and used throughout the district in all ESL and bilingual education programs. This program is the focus of each morning's language development instruction. Note: During the 1989-1990 academic year, teachers began to use Santillana Publishing Companys adaptation of the San Diego School District program -- "Bridge to communication program" as classrooms, several teachers indicated that they are not "pleased" with the Santillana adaptation of the originally written district ELEPs program, and that they would informally continue to use and rely on the district developed ELEPs program.

20. **Instructional strategies utilized:**

- X **Team teaching** (Two or more teachers/aides are responsible for instruction in the same classroom)
- X **Peer teaching** (Older students with more English proficiency work with LEP students to provide translation)
- X **Cooperative learning** (Instructional activities require that students collaborate to produce a common product)
- X **Individualized instruction** (IEPs and other strategies are used to individualize instruction for students)
- X **Language experience approach** (Reading, writing, speaking, listening are taught interactively building on students' experiences as basis for language learning experiences)
- X **Small group instruction** (Students are grouped for instruction along varying criteria which are instructionally related)
- X **Laboratory instruction** (Students are provided variety of environments in a single laboratory for learning skills and content)
- X **Community resources** (Resources from outside the school, including volunteers, are tapped to provide instructional support)
- X **Other**: Integrated Content Area Instruction during the p.m. instructional period.

Social studies is taught in the primary language on a daily, pull-out basis. This program enables students to discuss and to interact with primary language aides and teachers who speak their native language. Aides follow the district guidelines, are monitored and plan their lessons with a certificated teacher.

21. Instructional Personnel

- X Teachers are trained in language development techniques
- X Teachers hold state certification for teaching LEP students-
- X Staff development is provided SAIP staff in latest research and methodologies
- X Staff development is regularly provided for mainstream teachers in language development strategies
- X Teachers are provided planning time during the school day
- X Instructional aides (Bilingual IAs assist teachers in the classroom)

The total staff participates in collaborative decision-making concerning the instructional program. The process started when the principal instituted planning for the state's School Improvement Program (SIP) which allocates extra funds for accommodating new organizational and instructional arrangements that are designed to meet perceived student needs. This SIP restructuring project emanated from a district wide move and policy adoption that called for the restructuring of schools, based on the evolution of several school reform initiatives which surfaced between 1983-1986.

Four additional teachers were added to the staff to address identified needs, thus reducing class size across the grades. The four programs they administer are: an entry level program, a Spanish bilingual class, a basic skills development/special education program, and a primary sheltered class.

The staff includes 7 Hispanic teachers, 1 Hmong teacher and 1 Vietnamese teacher. These teachers provide primary language instruction for delivering the district's social-studies curriculum.

Each teacher is given two 45-minute preparation periods each week.

The school has a LEP review team similar to a consultation or child-study team. The team makes individual referrals and conducts biannual reviews to place students and to move them through the levels.

22. Community involvement

- X Parent advisory committee
- X Parents as volunteers
- _ Evening ESL classes offered to parents
- X Home visits made by bilingual community liaisons (once a month)
- _ Open house for parents to learn about program
- X Other: All students are given standard binders with a special section devoted to communication with parents for homework and class work.

The Parent Outreach/Education Program is based on a needs assessment that was conducted with the parents. Workshops are provided by community/staff members in the appropriate languages. (On any one evening, workshops are conducted in five languages, each language in a separate room.) Monthly home visits are conducted by a cadre of community aides. Traditional approaches such as organized parent groups and volunteer activities are also in place.

Strong cooperative ties are maintained with the Boy's Club, Recreation Department, and the local library as well as the regional division of the Police Department. This cooperation results in special Saturday programs and special assemblies and trips.

Student performance:

It should be noted that the restructuring process at the school which resulted in the SAIP was undertaken beginning in Spring 1988. Thus, student achievement cannot be reported as yet for what changes, if any, have occurred that can be related directly to program treatment. Data from the state assessment program are provided for the years 1984-88 only. Data, however, will be available for this academic year after results from standardized tests become available. Given the computerized district-wide system, data will be retrievable for comparison of language groups. Student performance records and performance checklists kept by each teacher are used in the LEP review process.

23. Evidence of exceptional LEP student performance in:

X **Relative gains in English proficiency**
How measured:

In as much as the entire student population at the school is included in the exemplary ELD program (with the exception of students in the Spanish and Vietnamese bilingual education program), the staff has devised a system of identifying students' English proficiency and assigning them to various levels in morning instructional groups. All students receive instruction in the same subjects at this time. Students are reassigned to successively higher groups as their proficiency increases. Reassessment of students' proficiency and reassignment to other language-development sections is conducted frequently. Between October 1988 and January 1989, a total of 38 students progressed through one or more levels of language proficiency.

X **Gains in academic performance**
How measured: state assessment program

__ **Time required before students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms**
The program is in its first year. Therefore, it is too early to determine how much time is required before students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms.

LINDA VISTA 1988-89 LEP	*Totals*
From entry level to sheltered A ***P(1) M (6) U(7)***	***14***
From sheltered A to sheltered B ***P(2) M(7) U(2)***	***11***
From sheltered B to transition A ***P(0) M(5) U(11)***	***16***
From transition A to transition B ***P(0) M(5) U(1)***	***6***
From transition B to English ***P(1) M(5) U(4)***	***10***
****Other***	

P 1 sheltered to English
P 1 English to Sheltered A-placed wrong
P 1 Sheltered B back to Sheltered A
P 1 English to Sheltered B

Waivered - 5
Reclassified P (0) M(12) U(11) = Total 23 reclassified

Linda Vista - 1989-1990	*Total*
From Entry level to sheltered A *P(2) M(6) U(5)*	*13*
From sheltered A to sheltered B *P(0) M(1) U(9)*	*10*
From sheltered B to transition A *P(0) M(3) U(5)*	*8*
From transition A to transition B *P(0) M(0) U(2)*	*2*
From transition B to English *P(0) M(2) U(7)*	*9*
**Other*	
Spanish to Sheltered B M(5)	*5*
Sheltered A remain in Sheltered A P(10)	*10*
Entry level remain in entry M(2) U(4)	*5*
Waivered - 4	
Reclassified P(1) M(6) U(6)	*13*

***
p - primary
m - middle
u - upper

24. Attendance: Attendance and mobility rates the years 1984-88 are as follows:

*

School Year	% Actual Attendance	% Mobility*
1984-85	95.80	40.8
1985-86	95.79	30.1
1986-87	95.96	46.8
1987-88	95.10	49.5
1988-89	94.64	

* Percent of students who leave, or leave and return

25. Other:

Narrative Description:

26. Theoretical framework of Exemplary Program: Restructuring appears to be most successful if

-- it is a pervasive, systemic change -- it affects each student in the school and it does not attack only one aspect of the school program.
-- it is based on a site-based management system.
-- decisions for change are student-oriented.
-- the empowering of staff is for a team effort and not merely individual efforts.
-- it uses non-traditional approaches.
-- it provides active support and leadership by the site administrator.

The overall philosophy is that each student, no matter how unique, can learn and that staff has the responsibility to ensure the best educational program possible.

27. Goals and objectives: The staff at these schools have restructured their entire educational program. Several major goals were addressed in the implementation of the restructuring: 1) to meet the diverse needs of each student through appropriate placement and an ungraded curriculum, 2) to provide an integrated experience as well as appropriate language placement, 3) to reduce pull-out instruction, 4) to provide access to all programs and 5) to implement a major community outreach program. Prior to arriving at these stated goals and objectives, Linda Vista teaching, administrative, support staff and parent/community representatives, met over a series of meetings, in order to establish a needs/criteria list, to lend toward the eventual "design" of the "Linda Vista Model." This process for self analysis and change began during the Spring semester of 1988. During this first meeting, staff were presented with "hard data" on student achievement, degree of classroom interruptions, pull-out instruction, etc. Participants were asked to generate the needs list, using these guiding themes:

•more appropriate instructional/language proficiency groupings for each student.
•less pullout instruction during morning hours.
•more integrated learning experiences.
•greater equity of services to all students.
•less labeling of special needs students.
•a more unified staff
•better use of space

Several overriding "umbrella" provisions/stipulations further guide the Linda Vista Plan. They include:

•an ungraded curriculum for the entire school
•development of an early childhood education program for all pre-kindergarten, kindergarten and special education SH students housed at the same annex site
•reduced class size--for all classrooms
•weekly preparation time to be provided for each teacher
reallocation of resources in order to implement the program

Hence, under these guiding themes, the specific plan addresses and incorporates all of the above stated criteria.

28. **Special program features**: It is important to note that the fluidity of the program is a priority. Expectations are high and students are expected to move from level to level as soon as they have met the criteria -- not necessarily at the end of the year. The principal attributes the success of the program to the teachers' ownership in the changes made and in the organization of the new program.

OVERRIDING LINDA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL THEMES

•strong staff support (evolutionary) buy in and ownership within a climate of collaboration and cooperation and "say" including site administration, teaching staff, support staff, certified staff and parent/community input.

•concern with "equitable" instruction FOR ALL STUDENTS AT LINDA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

•movement and fluidity of the program/e.g. students movement into different configurations for various instructional purposes/different instructional groupings for different instructional needs/intentions.

•ongoing, integrated learning experiences

•active and on-going staff involvement in the design and delivery/implementation of the SAIP and student assessment for movement within and across the program, e.g. LEP Review Team

•teaming and communication between teachers/based on instructional needs and teaching strengths and interests

•grouping of LEP students based on degree of English language proficiency, for instructional purposes

•primary language instructional grouping for ALL STUDENTS DURING 1 PERIOD OF THE DAY--SOCIAL STUDIES

•ALL students are integrated and mainstreamed for two periods of the day, e.g. all students have the opportunity to interact with one another regardless of race, ethnicity, dominant language, English language proficiency and gender.

•reallocation of resources to build upon and strengthen several existing practices.

•process oriented model

•a pervading sense of "schoolwide" effectiveness

•the notion of "building upon" and "celebrating diversity" is an underlying theme that is present in this SAIP. Students are not isolated from one another. Provisions have been made to insure against isolation of students.

•utilization of innovative, multidimensional, instructional, curricular, management, grouping and day to day scheduling practices.

•staff and students at Linda Vista have created a learning environment that is DYNAMIC AND ACTIVE. Students are active participants in this environment. A real "team effort" seems to be in place.